THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

'I HAVE tried in this book, with the aid of human reason, which God gave us to use in His service, and of human experience in history and life, to set down the fixed points, as it were, of the Christian system, which joined together make up that framework upon which each will construct his own picture of ultimate reality.' These words come from the Preface to a competent, popular, and readable outline of Christian Doctrine from the pen of the Rev. Leslie SIMMONDS, M.A., Assistant Priest of All Saints, Margaret Street, London—*The Framework of Faith* (Longmans ; 8s. 6d. net).

This book is one of a series of books, 'The Teaching of the Church Series,' planned to be of help to 'the Parish Priest and his Workers, as they reply to the challenges of this generation with the challenges of Christ.' How far it succeeds in its purpose may be gathered from an account of one of its chapters. There are chapters on the Existence, Nature, and Revelation of God, the Nature of Man, God-Made-Man, Redemption, The Church, and Man's Final Destiny. Let us examine the chapter on the central theme of Christian Doctrine, which is 'God-Made-Man.'

In the first part of the chapter the point is well made that Christianity is the religion of the Incarnation. It is founded not upon an ethical standard or a way of life but upon a Person who claimed Divinity for Himself, and who from the day of His Resurrection has been acclaimed as both God and Man. In the third part of the chapter there is given a good conspectus of the teaching of Christ as the Way, the Truth, and the Life. It is on the middle part that we concentrate, where the attempt is made to expound the doctrine of the Incarnation.

The first Christians were ready to worship Christ as God, while at the same time acknowledging Him as Man, without any questions as to how Godhead and Manhood could be united in one Person. But as the years passed it became essential, not only for the proper understanding of the faith but also for the safeguarding of it from attacks from without, that it should be set forth in terms of the current thought of the Patristic Age. This effort culminated in the Definition of Chalcedon (A.D. 451), which contains the main outlines of the orthodox Christology.

In the Definition of Chalcedon the dogma of the Two Natures in One Person was laid down. But the question had been asked, and is still asked, How can we conceive of Godhead and Manhood as being joined together to compose one Person? The key is only to be found, as Mr. SIMMONDS says, in the mystery of personality. Now personality is not the same thing as the individual soul. There is a reality behind both the soul, with its quota of powers of intellect and will, and the body, with its collection of limbs and organs and nerves. And this reality we call personality.

'A human being is compounded of the common stock (which is human nature) together with something, different in each being, which distinguishes him from all the rest of mankind. In mathematical language, an individual is a constant, plus a variable. The constant is our common human nature. The variable is personality.'

As personality is not an assumption but a reality, we must conclude that at the creation of each new being there is added to that common nature an eternally distinguishable mark. But in Christ the place which, in other individuals, is occupied by a created human personality is taken by the uncreated and eternal Person of the Word of God. That is the only possible way in which it can be explained how the Word became flesh.

This explanation secures the true unity of God and man in the one Christ. His Manhood was not swallowed up in His Divinity. He remained in full possession of that common stock, that human nature, which He shared with other members of the human race. Nor, on the other hand, was there in Him a dual personality. The human personality which results in the ordinary course of God's creative power was replaced in His case by the Divine.

Moreover, through this explanation alone the true relationship of the two natures can be realized. The Manhood of Christ is seen to be the instrument of His Godhead, the active channel of the Divine power and truth; just as in the human body the hand is the living instrument of the brain. It is not in spite of the taking upon Himself of human nature that God reveals Himself to men, but by the means of a complete human nature whose powers are used as instruments and channels of the Divine Personality.

Students of Christology will here recognize an attempt to present in a modern way that Cyrillian theology of the Incarnation which was endorsed by St. Thomas and by the Protestant Reformers, and which remains the standard of Christological orthodoxy. It is, however, not easy to see how reality may be ascribed to the 'constant,' which is our common human nature, apart from the 'variable,' which is personality. An impersonal human nature appears to be a mere abstraction.

That leading representative of the new orthodoxy, Professor Emil Brunner, does not appear to uphold the Chalcedonian formula of the Two Natures in One and its Cyrillian interpretation in quite the same way as this. He allows personality to the God-man, in the sense of created human personality, but what he does not allow is human personality in the moral sense. He distinguishes between 'person' and personality in the moral sense, and says that in the secret places where ordinary human beings possess sinful personality Jesus Christ possesses the eternal and Divine 'Person' of the Logos. So long as the Divine and the human are regarded as disparate entities there is perhaps no better way of expressing the Christian sense of the Divinity of Jesus Christ.

The Rev. William Paton, M.A., D.D., the well-known Secretary of the International Missionary Council, has published his 'Social Service Lecture' for 1939 under the curious and *démodé* title, *The White Man's Burden* (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net). There is nothing *démodé* about the lecture, however. And the title is in the nature of a challenge, as one might say: 'Is this to-day the attitude we should adopt towards the dark races? Does this century-old phrase really express what we feel about our duty and opportunity in regard to peoples whom historical events have more or less put in our charge?'

The situation, to begin with, is not what it was. The dark races have become highly vocal. They are inclined to insist on their own point of view. They want to do, and not only to be done for. They are getting a self-consciousness. The most obvious example of this is India, but it is true all over. And the problem Dr. Paton sets in his lecture is a terribly urgent one: What *is* our duty to-day?

He reminds us that, speaking quite generally, there are two distinct standpoints in the Christian camp. There are the social reformers, who contend that our task is to bring in the Kingdom of God, so to shape the structure of human society that it will correspond to God's will. Our immediate duty is to deal with conditions that prevent the Kingdom coming—economic exploitation, malnutrition, and the like. Whatever the Kingdom of God means, it means at least a human society on this earth remoulded after the mind and will of Christ.

On the other side there are those who, in the words of the German statement at the Madras Conference, believe that 'the Church has not to bring into force a social programme for a renewed world order or even a Christian State.' Of course the Church must give itself to works of Christian compassion. But our immediate task is to preach the gospel, to win men to God, to present a Saviour to sinners. The Church of Christ is an interim body between the times of God, who has sent the Saviour and will send Him again.

It is not enough to say that both these contentions are sound. We must get beneath them to fundamental principles if we are to deal rightly with the concrete matters that really concern us. And so Dr. PATON sets out to state four positions which, after endless discussion with men of many nations, he holds to be true and to be defensible on Christian and Biblical grounds.

In the first place, the Kingdom of God in the teaching of Jesus and in the thought of the New Testament is always something that God brings in, never something that man achieves. 'The Kingdom will come in' (Dr. Edwyn Bevan is quoted), 'by some display of God's power and glory, which all men, whatever their wills may be, will not be able to help seeing.' And yet this is to happen *here*. The Kingdom is brought in by God in His own time, consummating the whole earthly process of which the Incarnation and Death and Resurrection of the Son, Jesus Christ, are the supremely significant points, transcending in its perfection the whole temporal process and yet governing it as the end to which it is directed and by which it is judged.

In the second place, He who shall come is He who has already come. To believe in Jesus Christ means that His mind is for us normative. It must govern our action; and so far as action by the individual is controlled by the general structure of society, Christians cannot help but strive to mould that society so that it may be easier for men to obey the mind of Christ. It will not do to say that any Christian action directed to the system and not only to the individual is un-Biblical, Utopian, and idealistic. A Christianity which sets the social system outside the area of Christian discipleship and effort has in fact very little to say to the actual world in which we live.

Further, is not the heart of the business simply the question of sin? The challenge to a Utopian Christian social movement lies in this fact of human sin. There is no reason that should prevent us doing all we can to bring about a juster and happier order of society, provided we remember that this demands the redeeming of men's souls as well as the illumination of their minds. It is not enough to set out fine ideals and programmes before us. We must remember that they have to be handled by, and on behalf of, those who are everywhere handicapped by frailty and folly and failure.

Dr. PATON's fourth point is just what St. John says in the First Epistle: 'Whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?' It is perhaps here that we find the best ground for uniting the different strains of Christian thinking. It is the effect on the one who has, and yet remains indifferent to the need of him who has not, that is the serious evil.

These are Dr. PATON's fundamental principles which should govern our thought and action in regard to the problems of race as a whole. And Dr. Paton proceeds to apply them trenchantly in three directions: to social and economic factors, to political factors, and to race. In the case of the

social and economic factors Dr. PATON discusses the results of Western influence on the East, both bad and good. In spite of much good that has been done, there is an enormous weight of evil to be set on the other side. And Dr. PATON is clear that the remedy must be social as well as individual.

'It must surely be plain that in these conditions we have to face not only the uplifting and converting . . . of great masses of individual men, but also and equally the alteration of systems which profoundly influence the life of those individuals. In India the social order moulds 350,000,000 people every thirty years into its own image. Social changes produce moral results; the approach of the reformer and of the missionary alike must be both individual and social.'

Under the head of 'political factors' Dr. PATON discusses the acute question of our position in India, and his statement on this momentous problem is one of the wisest, most balanced, and satisfying we have seen. It amounts to this: We must as Christians insist upon the moral principles which alone justify the continuance, for a time, of the government of one people by another. Further, if it is true that we can help India to do justice to her minorities, and that without that help people whom historical events have entrusted to us must suffer, we must be sure that this is not a cloak for motives of a different sort. Finally, it is abundantly clear that the period of transition from complete dependence to complete independence ought not to be short, and that the best guidance we can give is needed. Let us provide this, in order that India may as soon as possible be able to assume her own burden.

It will be understood from this rapid summary how valuable a contribution this experienced and wise observer has made to the problems both of missionary policy and of international and social relations. And it ought to be said that in all Dr. PATON writes he has in view not only the individual but the Church. It is when we gather our ideas of Christian reforming, he says, into the bosom of the Church that we get away from the conception of Christianity as merely ideas to be applied. It is life to be lived and power to be known. It is in the Church that racial pride can be overthrown, political life can be judged by a Christian insight, and social disintegration can be stayed by the power of a new bond of fellowship.

Science has acquired a very great prestige in our time, and its dicta are received by many with reverential awe. There is a popular idea that science provides us with the only reliable knowledge we have. 'Scientific' has almost come to be a synonym for 'true.'

This is not the view held by leading scientists themselves. Some of them have been at pains to warn us that science by its very nature cannot possibly cover the whole field of reality. Its methods are adapted to certain specific ends. It is like a net specially constructed to catch certain kinds of fish, and which therefore allows much else to pass through its meshes.

The scientist aims at giving a picture of the world that shall be purely objective, quite independent of any particular individual's way of looking at it. He assumes the rôle of an unbiassed spectator, standing apart from the thing he is observing, taking the greatest care not to interfere in any way with its action, and he strives to depict the object as it really and truly is. If he succeeds then he will be able to point to it and say, 'There it is, standing out there in time and space, undistorted by human fancy, no product of the imagination, but an independent entity firm as a rock and providing the only sure foundation on which men may build.'

Is such knowledge possible, or if possible can it be regarded as complete? Is it a full and adequate representation of reality? Leading scientists would repudiate such a suggestion with an emphasis which it would be impossible to exaggerate. Max Planck, the author of the Quantum Theory, declares that the difference between reality and the scientific

representation of it is as great as the difference between a cow and the picture of a cow, while Sir James Jeans remarks on 'the growing conviction that the ultimate realities of the universe are at present quite beyond the reach of science, and may be—and probably are—for ever beyond the comprehension of the human mind.'

Two difficulties in the way of regarding scientific knowledge as adequate and complete will readily occur to any thoughtful mind. One is that the scientist can only observe the world through the medium of some organ of sense, and can only make a representation of it through some activity of his own mind. How can he be sure that in passing through this medium reality has not suffered some distortion or obscuring? The most rigorous experiment must always in the last resort be controlled and influenced by the observer's own perceptions, and though it may be checked by the work of a thousand other observers they all suffer from a like limitation.

The other difficulty is that the scientist, when he stands apart from the world as a mere observer, puts himself thereby deliberately out of the picture. The world which he observes is not the complete world, but the world *minus* the observer. Now, however modest the scientist may be, we must insist that he is an essential part of the world, and that a description of reality without him is incomplete. But there is no possible way by which he can remedy this, however willing he may be. The eye may see everything round about it, but it can never possibly see itself. So the scientific observer can never abstract himself from himself, so as to get an objective view of himself. Who, then, is going to observe the observer? If you say, 'Bring in another observer,' then that other observer is *eo ipso* excluded from the picture. And as all intelligent beings who can be objectively observed may themselves become in their turn observers we can see how large and important elements in the realm of reality cannot be brought under scientific observation.

Problems of this sort are dealt with by Professor John MACMURRAY in *The Boundaries of Science* (Faber & Faber; 7s. 6d. net). It need hardly be said that the treatment is exceedingly fresh and thought-provoking. In the sub-title the book is described as 'A Study in the Philosophy of Psychology,' and Professor MACMURRAY deals principally with the branches of science which concern themselves with the various aspects of human conduct, because in them the limitations or boundaries of science are most clearly seen. We can only indicate very briefly some of the lines of thought pursued.

'Science is a characteristic activity of the Western societies of the modern period.' This is very apt to be forgotten in the halo which is now thrown around modern science. It seems often to be regarded as some sort of final and absolute truth in contrast to the imperfect ideas and formulations of other ages. A sociological study of the modern period, however, shows science as one of its natural products. When the human mind threw off its shackles at the Renaissance there arose a mighty wave of discontent with things as they were and a keen desire to master and improve the environment. This movement has been, of course, opposed throughout by a conservative spirit which resents all change, and resents it most keenly where science threatens to touch on man's own life and conduct.

Accordingly progress was first made in the realm of the inorganic, where only the material environment was affected. 'The material world is less highly charged with emotion than the field of organic or personal life. The social inhibitions which prevent the investigation of the material world are consequently more easily overcome. The mind will resist any interference with its customary attitudes to the world in the field of biology or psychology much more strongly than in the field which physics studies.'

The next stage was the introduction of scientific method into the field of the organic. This stage corresponds roughly with the nineteenth century. And now the final stage is reached to-day in the application of scientific method in the field of

psychology. As science has thus widened its scope there has been a continual tendency in the direction of a materialistic interpretation of phenomena. The physicist has tended to interpret the organic in terms of the inorganic. The biologist has tended to over-emphasize what is common to human and animal life, and to ignore the differences which centre in the intentional character of all typically human action.

Now a difficulty begins to emerge for science. It is somewhat similar to that which confronts the complete sceptic. If his theory of scepticism is true, then he must be sceptical of the truth of his own scepticism. In like manner the scientist, if he concludes that the world is a materialistic system in which every event is rigidly determined by pre-existing conditions, must in consistency include his own scientific theory in the system. He must regard it as the inevitable product of certain pre-existing conditions over which he has no control, and consequently his theory cannot be true, for in such a system questions of truth and falsehood are quite irrelevant.

This difficulty comes to light most clearly in the new psychology, which claims to give a scientific account of the operations of the human mind. The theory maintains that all human behaviour is a reaction to a stimulus. If this is true then the production of the theory also is a reaction to some stimulus, and belief or disbelief in it is a similar reaction. 'What, then, can be meant by asking whether the theory is true? The question whether it is true can only be another reaction to a stimulus.' All the same the psychologist in producing his theory evidently means it to be taken as really true and not a mere reaction to a stimulus.

This difficulty leads to a glaring inconsistency when the practice of psycho-therapy is based on the new psychology. In the theory the subconscious is the real determinant of conduct, and the conscious is the unreal. But in the practice of psycho-therapy this is reversed. The aim is to bring to light elements of the subconscious in order that they may be controlled by the conscious. 'If, then, we were to take the theory at its face value, we should have to conclude that if the theory were true the practice based upon it would be impossible; and since the practice is not merely possible but practically successful, the theory could not be true.'

This antinomy is resolved when it is recognized that there is an element in human behaviour which is not observable by science, the very element which makes it characteristically human. 'It is the determination or modification of the observable, objective behaviour by subjective intentions. It is, in fact, what is referred to in human behaviour by the term "reason".' The knowledge which science gives is merely instrumental. The question whether it becomes an instrument of good or evil is from the purely scientific point of view irrelevant. 'Whether it is employed for good or bad purposes, for construction or for destruction, to increase happiness or to increase misery, depends upon the character of the intentions which it serves. If there can be no knowledge which enables us to unify or harmonize the very many inconsistent intentions which human beings seek to realize, then there can be no way open to us by which we can control, to the slightest extent, our own destiny or the future of the societies to which we belong. Whether the result of science will be to increase the intensity and horror of an inherently meaningless existence or will lead to peace and the increase of human happiness must be a matter of pure chance about which we can literally do nothing at all. . . . For myself, I find such a conclusion not merely abhorrent, but completely absurd.'

Constructive Theology.

IV. Creation.

By Professor John Macleod, M.A., D.D., University of Aberdeen.

The acknowledgment of God as the Creator is a fundamental element in the Christian creed. 'Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear' (He 11^3). This confession of faith is strongly present in Hebrew religion, but Christianity does more than take it over in the legacy of history. For the faith that is fertilized by the revelation in Jesus Christ the idea of creation takes upon it an enriched body of meaning. By its own inner logic Christianity must be a religion of 'the origin.' It was for this reason that the early apologists and expositors of the Christian faith rejected with emphasis the teaching of Marcion. Creatorship and Redeemership were not to be sundered.

It is the function of theology to take into its care this 'understanding of faith,' to let the 'reason' in it cultivate and unfold itself, and to inquire what are the positive conceptions of the world (and of our existence in the world) which belong legitimately to it. As the student of the history of theology knows this task occasioned for the Christian mind periods of anxiety and controversy. This was more particularly the case within the area of modern thought. For by then developments in scientific knowledge of the world seemed to say that there was 'no need of the hypothesis' of a Divine Creative Purpose. And in addition, within religious thought itself, real differences were emerging with regard to the Scriptural connexions and foundations of the creation doctrine.

It will not be necessary within the intention of this article to dwell upon that long and troubled history. There were disputations in which wisdom was not always with the Church. But we may hope that they have borne good fruit, and that now the Church can possess her doctrine at this point unencumbered by mythology or speculation. The idea of creation is a difficult one in itself, but it is much if we have learned not to put the difficulty in the wrong place.

I. In his book, *The Christian Faith*, Haering reminds us that in the interest and inquiry of religion there arise in close relation, the two questions—Whence is the world? and Whereunto is the world? And he adds, 'the ground of the world needs the purpose to elucidate it' (i. 363). It is necessary all through our theological discussions to remember that if we remove the idea of creation from that context we shall misconceive its place and force in a Christian philosophy. With this reminder let us endeavour to state what answers the above questions find in the Christian understanding of creation, and then follow that with some observations upon certain of the questions which arise because of that understanding.

(*a*) The Christian mind confesses the dependence of all existence upon the power and will of God. The world is not self-derived, nor self-explanatory (and our existence in the world shares in that peculiarity). There is a world because the will and wisdom of God called it into being. This does not mean only that we credit God with the *order* we find in the world. It means that God *initiated* the reality that includes the orders we find. The dependence is thoroughgoing, for it is God that has conferred being upon what exists. 'The world of our experience,' says Professor Bowman, 'is the objective equivalent of God's eternal experience of what is possible' (*Studies in the Philosophy of Religion*, ii. 427). But this world does not derive from God by any necessity other than that which is appropriate to the Divine will and choice.

'On the creation hypothesis,' says W. R. Matthews, 'we face the full consequences of our faith that all things depend on God. He is responsible for the world because . . . in principle and in general structure, in its mystery and terrible potentialities for good and evil, with its risks and its tragedy, its

offer of triumph or disaster, it has been chosen by Him' (*Studies in Christian Philosophy*, 199).

(*b*) This choice and this responsibility remain in exercise, for the world continues and is sustained because the Divine interest and care rest upon it. The Christian mind has never found proper rest in the idea of God as a First Cause. It is not alone in its origin that the world has a relation to God, but in its history, its livingness, its blossoming into new things, its garnering of the old. Faith confesses both that the world is 'from His hand' and 'in His hands.' And as such it is at His disposal for the ends that He wills to be served. But the relation acknowledged here is not that fusion of the life of God with the world which appears so often in pantheistic interpretations of reality. Upon what the Personal God creates He confers true being. Existing unto God it has its own 'otherness' from God, and is not merely a part of divinity. 'God,' says Gilson, 'does not substitute Himself for things so as to act in their place' (*Spirit of Mediæval Philosophy*, 163). The *Deus sive Natura* of philosophy, however, is a kind of sacramentalism which cannot keep itself immune from a real though refined naturalism. In his extensive examination of the philosophies of Whitehead and Santayana, Professor Bowman holds that their interpretation of the world (aiming at a religious significance) fails because they virtually ignore the cleavage of nature and spirit. 'A theory of being which would partly submerge the spiritual in the physical, and partly permit it to play as a faint iridescence on the surface of animal life is unable to sustain the weight of all those disciplines in which the spirit demands for itself a position of centrality and of pre-eminence over the conditions of a natural existence' (*A Sacramental Universe*, 129).

(*c*) As the creation of God the world is bound over unto the service of God. Whereunto then is the world? What is it instrumental for? It is, says John Calvin, to be 'the theatre of His glory.' What end or ends are involved in that great phrase? It has been pointed out by those who make use of the analogy of creative art that what the artist creates has its own justification, its own joy for him irrespective of what others may derive from it. We may then hold with truth that a world which owes its being to the riches and activity of the Divine Nature is in itself and as such of value to God, confers joys upon its Author unknown and inconceivable by us.

Yet we must hold that, as God is Personal Being, among the values which are real to Him none could have primacy over the experience of being known and received and acknowledged by other subjects. This is the Christian conviction that while creation may have many meanings they belong nevertheless to an order which fundamentally is laid out on spiritual lines. Hence the world is instrumental in the sense that it opens the possibility and ministers to the possibility of a great enterprise of 'soul making.' The world is not made for man if we mean by that that he is to cultivate and subdue it to his purposes. Rather man is made in and with the world in order that his self may grow into community with the Source of all life, into sustained acts of reverence towards that Source as the true determinant of destiny, and thereby 'to find all right uses of the world' (J. Oman).

'God creates,' says Gilson, 'not that there may be witnesses to render Him His due glory, but beings who shall rejoice in it as He rejoices in it Himself, and who participating in His being participate at the same time in His beatitude. It is not therefore for Himself but for us that God seeks His glory; it is not to gain it, for He possesses it already, nor to increase it, for already it is perfect, but to communicate it to us' (*Spirit of Mediæval Philosophy*, 104).

(*d*) In the understanding of faith then God requires the world for the goal He intends; it is His gift to man, yet it remains world,—finite, fragmentary, creaturely. The satisfactions of the instrument are not commensurate with the intent of the will that ordained it. Therefore the maintenance of the world by the Creator (the Divine Immanence) will also offer itself in a ministry whereby man may realize a life that is a victory over the world. God gives man the order of time to use but His eternity also for its use. But in the actuality of existence it is not alone the fact of the transitory and the fragmentary that the Creator's purpose has to meet. The world of the creature has become

the world of the sinner. Maintenance then must take upon it the task of restoration; the will to fellowship in the Eternal as it moulds and moves through history must be the creation of community for the sinful. The 'ground,' Haering said, needs the 'purpose' to elucidate it, but the elucidation has addressed us in the order and ministry of forgiveness. This is the decisive emphasis in Christianity. There is a new creation, and it is such that it is ministered from the Source. We confess God the Creator because there is knowledge of God the Redeemer. 'The divinely revealed end of nature and of history guarantees the divine origin and control of both' (Macaulay, *The Death of Jesus*, 22).

The Christian creed sustains the acceptance of the world and of life as good, but where this lays hold upon us, in an awareness which is the justification of God and the satisfaction of our being, is not in generalized impressions of meaning (important though these be) but in that encounter with Jesus Christ where truth and love in passion claim sovereignty over our souls.

II. The statement thus given has sought to express some of the essential affirmations which belong to the Christian doctrine of creation. In the rest of this article a number of detached reflections will be offered within the area of the statement given. What further clarification of the meaning of the creation doctrine is possible and necessary? What limits belong to it, and what inferences derive legitimately from it?

We can be glad that a constructive theology need no longer be entangled in the notion that the doctrine of creation is an explanation, an account of how the world began to be. At this point Biblical literalism was giving but ill service to a good cause, with its insistence that the doctrine required the assent of the mind to creation narratives. 'It pleased God,' says Calvin, 'that a history of the creation should exist' (*Institutes*, i. ch. 14). But in this connexion it is more fitting to discover the 'pleasure' of God in the words that came out of the whirlwind to Job. 'Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? declare, if thou hast understanding. When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?' (Job $38^{4.\ 7}$). What the understanding of man declares in the doctrine of creation is an answer to the question Why? not an answer to the question How? The reason why there is a world is that God chose, willed it should exist. But the *manner* in which that choice, that will eventuated into the causalities of existence remains, and must remain utterly beyond our grasp. We cannot surprise the secrets of that legislation, nor is that required for the conviction of faith that the world is and abides because a divine legislation exists. It is the duty of theology that has learned the lessons of past controversy to make plain that the doctrine of creation is the acceptance by the mind of the mystery of the world. We, too, like the physicist—but for deeper reasons—confess 'this mysterious universe.' Nevertheless it is not an irrational mystery, for in ourselves we experience personal, volitional activity becoming fruitful unto the causalities of deeds.

It is appropriate then at this point to comment on the meaning to be attached to the claim—which is a right claim—that this doctrine of creation is fundamentally Biblical. The supposition that the Christian doctrine of creation has some necessary connexion with the Genesis narratives, 'has caused,' says W. R. Matthews, 'a great deal of confusion' (*Studies in Christian Philosophy*, 198). It is not an important thing as such that the literature of Hebrew religion contains creation narratives. Such are to be found elsewhere in various forms. They are indeed signs that from the earliest times man has been visited and made curious by the intuition that agency of personal import is the key to what exists. But the important thing in the Old Testament is the experience of life which makes use of and controls the narratives. When the prophet Isaiah cries, 'Lift up your eyes on high, and see who hath created these' (Is 40^{26}), his awareness is determined by the revelation in the personal order of the quality of existence itself. There is a purpose announcing itself in conscience, there is a judgment and a sovereignty of moral intent with its hands upon history, there is a will in the voice of events claiming man for itself. And this ingression of order and claim into life is of such a kind that it comes from the reality that founded existence for man. It

is here, in the prophetic witness, and not in annals of origin, that we touch the nerve of the passion in Hebrew religion to deny nothing to the range of the lordship of God. 'He made the stars also.' It is the claim that the whole is His because in the whole of life He confronts and claims all of ours. Herrmann in his *Dogmatik* has the sentence, 'that spiritual victory over the world which is expressed in the first sentence of Scripture' (p. 81). It is a saying which renders to us the essential in the Biblical doctrine. In this sense Christianity received the doctrine, and consummated it through the witness of Jesus and His confession of thanksgiving unto the Father, the Lord of Heaven and Earth (Mt 11^{25}).

Biblical religion is insight born out of the experience of purpose, and in the creation idea it gives primacy to that purpose. Only as paying the religious homage to that purpose at the root of being are 'narratives' of any interest or value to theology.

Reference has already been made to the serious and confused situation which was created for theology by the developments and the claims of the scientific knowledge of the world. One or two aspects of that may be usefully considered here. Theology was surely on insecure ground when it confronted the modern cosmological inquiries with the assertion that it had, scripturally, the true science. If indeed the question at issue concerns the causal sequences in things then, to use what was once a battle phrase, 'Darwin is more authoritative than Genesis.' On the other hand, when science proceeded to claim, or at least to imply, that the 'secret' of the world could be stated in terms of necessary causal laws or the movement defined as evolution it was taking undue liberties with its true task, and misusing its own evidence.

For the 'myth' of Genesis, it substituted a 'myth' of its own, and that an inferior and even contradictory one. The roots of the doctrine of creation are religious, not scientific (in the proper sense of the word), and we may be glad for the measure of clarification and understanding reached concerning the significance this has both for science and theology. It is the business of science to deal with the world as given, to discover the order and linkages that belong to its facts, to know it in activity and process. All this is of importance to religion, indeed for this religious thought should continually call. For if the world is of God, then by everything we learn of its constitution and functioning we are also learning of Him. If, for example, as the idea of evolution suggests, the causalities that have entered into existence have operated slowly rather than quickly, acting not only at a point of time but through time, all this is knowledge that can be planted without confusion within the Christian confession of God the Creator. Every discipline and search of mind whereby we are informed about our world should have upon it the approval and encouragement of the Christian faith. When, however, science attempts to decide upon the ultimate significance of what is there, when it seeks with the facts to state the meaning of the facts, it has come into the sphere of values, and judgments of value. And in that sphere all that is in the man, not merely his science, is summoned to the experience of judgment. In this connexion one of the characteristics of science, in its chief representatives to-day, is the readiness to acknowledge that its interpretive ministry is limited. It sees in part and knows in part even as religion does. It is not the purpose of science to 'prove' religion, and only a false religion would make now any such claim upon it. But science is religious enough to pause and to hesitate at the difficulty of the thought that the impersonal and the fortuitous have been responsible for the wealth and wonder of life.

'Let me tell you then why the Creator made the world of generation. He was good, and the good can never have jealousy of anything. And being free of jealousy he desired that all things should be as like himself as they could be. This is, in the truest sense, the origin of Creation and of the World, as we shall do well to believe on the testimony of wise men. God desired that all things should be good and nothing bad so far as that was possible.' These fine famous words are Plato's; they are addressed to Socrates in the dialogue of the *Timaeus*. Without reading Christianity into Plato, we can carry his words into Christian use. God is good, and His goodness is the meaning of

the world. That is the Christian faith. It renders thanks unto Jesus Christ

> ' for the sense thy living self doth breed
> that Fatherhood is at the world's great core.'

Yet now theology, which is this faith in self-reflection, must register also faith's knowledge that in such high doctrine there are burdens for the mind. Though the Early Church triumphed over Marcion, the ghost of Marcion returns! The progress of knowledge has sharpened man's sense of the world in its immensity, its multifariousness, its hard inscrutability. In the universe we know ' and have to accept ' we design our machines; what, then, if the truth of its design is ' the mind of the mathematician ' ? How is this great whole of being to be intuited as the form in which ' the good that is without jealousy ' works and wills the good in which man can rejoice and rest? It belongs to theology to say that this understanding of faith sheds light upon a wider area of facts than any other view of existence, and that where it has not yielded the expected illumination it yet ministers unexpected succour. But with this claim—and it is a well-founded claim—there are also admissions which are very relevant here. For theology also—no matter how ' constructive '—the enigmatic and inscrutable aspects of existence remain. It confesses the mystery of the world not only in the sense that it cannot describe its coming to be, but also in this, that there are depths in its being and ways beyond any comprehension of ours. There is much which does not seem to be in any immediate relation to use or value, and indeed Nature's ' indifference ' and the ' chanciness ' of things appear at enmity with purpose. But theology conceives that man is ' being created ' ; his existence is a career transcending the content of time. Hence we may not yield to the notion that a world less wild and mysterious, less austere and more manageable would have been better. Better for what? The world we know, even in its menace, may be for our defence against a low answer to that. Theology, too, with its doctrine of creation is called to secure it aright in its understanding of the meaning of Providence. The world of our experience has joy and sorrow, ease and strife, rising and falling in it. It stands for ever within the Divine causality, yet it owns numerous causalities of its own. How, then, shall it be received and wherein does its value consist?

' There is no such thing possible,' wrote Dr. John Oman, ' as a natural belief in Providence, because the world is not good on mere natural lines. For such ends as comfort or health or prosperity to all or even as material rewards to the righteous, it is ostentatiously not good. A true belief in Providence is the goal and not the starting-point of religion, a prophetic victory over evil, and not a metaphysical optimism about the balance of " good " ' (*Grace and Personality*, 4th ed., 88).

God's Providence is not synonymous with occurrence as such. As made for God our end is the winning of freedom, and the exercise of it in responsibility. As it is stated by St. Paul, ' this is the will of God, even your sanctification ' (1 Th 4^3). Hence it belongs to the Christian verdict upon life to say that even through evil calamity this may be conferred upon us; and that the good of life has become perilous if it is shutting us out from it.

By faith we understand. And it remains the understanding of faith. True, it will always be a *fides quaerens intellectum*, as Anselm said. But as Anselm knew full well it is not by the ' intellectum ' it lives. The doctrine of creation, Karl Barth reminds us, has little to say about a ' world view.' ' It is a statement about God ' (*Credo*, 28). It is a statement about God and about the God who has given a disclosure of His nature and will. Christian thought had to reject many world conceptions, Emanationism, Pantheism, Dualism, Deism, in the course of its history. But it offers itself thus not in the strength of a philosophy but in the power of a gospel of God. It unites and keeps together the ideas of Creation, Providence, Redemption. In this synthesis the Christian mind delivers to us its account of the world.

The Wise Men and their Gifts

(Matthew ii.)

By the Reverend Wm. Edgar, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Glasgow.

When the Eastern Sages made their long journey to Jerusalem the Holy Child may have been at least one year old. This may be inferred from the inquiries and the atrocious deeds of Herod. The Sages made certain statements about themselves which require careful consideration. They had come from the East; they were guided by a Star; they were seeking One who was born King of the Jews; and they had come to worship Him.

The term 'East' is at once definite and indefinite. It is clear as to direction; but does not tell us how far east, nor what land is implied. It does, however, seem to carry with it an atmosphere of strangeness and remoteness.

The affirmation about star-guidance strengthens the previous impression and, indeed, it does more; for it suggests a land where Astrology was practised; and so Babylonia or Persia immediately looms up before us.

The appearance of the Star seems to have convinced them that something of tremendous significance had happened. The Star had also served to indicate to them in a general way where the event had taken place; but it failed to enlighten them as to the nature of the event or the exact place where it had happened. The Sages must have consulted Jewish sources before they could have spoken of One 'born King of the Jews.' Besides, they did actually make inquiries in Jerusalem before they knew that the exact place was Bethlehem. The purpose of their coming was clearly stated and subsequently acted upon. They had 'come to worship him.' Now this implies at once that they were doing more than paying their respects to an infant king. In this child they saw something more than what was natural and normal. Possibly they may have caught some faint gleam of Messianic hopes from Jews with whom they had conversed; but it is more likely that their impressions of one who was born a king would be such as were common in the Gentile world. The idea in their mind, and expressed in their act of worship, seems to correspond with the ancient conception of the *divine King*. Such an idea was actually in evidence at the time; for the *Divus* Augustus was on the throne of the Western world. But this idea of a divine king is a very old one, having swayed the mind of man for hundreds or thousands of years. The king was the peoples' leader; but he was also their representative. Indeed, he was the palladium or luck of his people. He must therefore be robust and fit. Any weakness in him would react on the people. Everything must be done to safeguard his person and surround him with splendour. A life of fullness and splendour here must be followed by a more splendid life in the hereafter. The king, regarded as more than a mortal while on earth, becomes truly a god in the other world. The acclamation: 'O king, live for ever' was not the language of flattery; but the expression of a people's belief in the divine kingship. Some such idea must have ruled in the minds of men who were searching for One who was born a king, and who actually worshipped Him when they came to the place where He was.

Having performed their act of homage, the Magi opened their treasures and 'presented unto him gifts.' There is nothing of peculiar importance in this, as the presentation of gifts was a practice generally observed. Gifts took numerous forms and were offered on a variety of occasions, and from various motives, noble and ignoble. Sometimes judges were bribed in order to frustrate the course of justice. Under the name of gifts were some cruel exactions made by kings and petty tyrants. The needs of appeasement were often served by a display of lavish generosity as when a trembling Jacob fortifies himself in this way when about to meet again the brother whom he once deceived. But higher motives actuated the bestowal of gifts. Friends often expressed the warmth of their regard in this way. The institution of marriage provided

the best of all opportunities for the exercise of this custom. But the most solemn and impressive of all occasions was when gifts were offered as an act of homage, as was the case with the Magi.

If there was nothing of outstanding significance in the mere *offering* of gifts, might there not be some particular message conveyed by the gifts themselves? We believe the answer to this question is in the affirmative. The gifts were chosen and presented with special reference to their objective and effect. They were meant for a king and therefore not intended for enrichment; but as a symbol of the beneficent influence they might exercise upon His person and His career.

Let us now consider these offerings in detail. 'They presented gold.' Perhaps nothing in the whole history of mankind has exercised a more potent influence for good or evil than the first of these gifts. We are all aware of the part gold has played as a medium of exchange. Its popularity, however, is not due to that. Long ages before this it was cherished because of its supposed influence over life and destiny. Among the substances charged with properties calculated to promote life and ward off death, gold held the foremost place. It became the symbol of the untarnishable and the incorruptible. In the Rig-Veda and the Avesta we clearly see what the Aryan-speaking peoples of India and Persia believed about the wonderful potencies of this substance. It was declared to be immortal, the rejuvenator of mankind and the bestower of immortality. It was born of the fire and was the very essence of light. Among the ancient Egyptians it was declared to be 'the luminous fluid of the sun, and the source of life and strength.' When Tutankamen died his frail body was encased in a coffin of pure gold. This was not a mere tribute of respect to his memory, but was an effort to prevent decay by the benign influence of this life-promoting and death-defying element. When, therefore, the Magi presented gold to the Infant King they performed an act of age-long significance. The good offices of gold were enlisted in the interest of kings especially, and its ritual usages were understood by the priests, whether in Egypt, Babylonia, or Persia. It is believed by many that the Wise Men were Babylonian or Median priests. If so, they would have understood the needs of the king's person.

Frankincense was the second of the gifts. As presented it would probably have consisted of pieces of hardened gum, varying in colour from amber and jade-green to brown. This gum was procured from the incense tree which grew only in the southern part of Arabia and to a small extent in Somaliland. The particular area was the Hadramaut,[1] a district stretching along the middle part of the extreme south of the peninsula. The best incense was procured from the valleys, away from the sea and not upon the hill-tops. Pliny refers to it as the land 'whose people alone and no other people among the Arabians behold the incense tree'

The lucrative trade in frankincense gave this land the name of *Felix*, meaning the happy or prosperous land. And so it was known as Arabia Felix.

The trade route along Southern Arabia brought this product, with other types of merchandise, to the Persian Gulf and as far as India. 'It was the richest, the most closely guarded and perhaps the oldest route in the world.' Frankincense was exported in large quantities to Babylonia and Persia. The inhabitants of the incense land paid an annual tribute of this substance to Darius. And it is recorded, too, that the Chaldean priests burned an immense quantity on the altar of Bel in Babylonia. This they procured by trade from Arabia.

The third of the gifts was myrrh—the Hebrew *môr* and the Arabic *murr*. Like frankincense this is obtained only from Southern Arabia and the adjacent parts of Africa. The exact area is the district called Yemen. Myrrh was also a gum procured from shrubs, and the colour of the gum varied from red or reddish-yellow to brown.

Myrrh acts as a stimulant and is antiseptic. It can be used as a perfume. It also helps to alleviate pain, and, indeed, was offered to our Lord at the Crucifixion. 'And they gave him to drink wine mingled with myrrh: but he received it not.'

There are two kinds of myrrh; but the variety grown in Yemen, the *murr* of the Arabs, alone

[1] Freya Stark, *The Southern Gates of Arabia* (1938).

concerns us here as it was the offering made by the Eastern Sages. There does not seem to have been the same glamour connected with myrrh as was manifestly the case with frankincense. Nevertheless it was precious and popular too. Among the items of merchandise mentioned by ancient writers as associated with the trade route to the East are actually these three—gold, frankincense, and myrrh! Consequently the Magi could have procured all three gifts from the land from which they set out. The Bible narrative is unambiguous in its assertion that these men came from the East. We leave the matter there, 'East is East,' whether the term be indefinite or not.

Literature.

DR. A. C. WELCH ON CHRONICLES.

The Schweich Lectures for 1938 were delivered by the veteran scholar Dr. A. C. Welch, under the title of *The Work of the Chronicler* (Milford; 7s. 6d. net). They form an important addition to the series of books in which the author has developed his view of the history of Israel, and should be read in conjunction with 'The Code of Deuteronomy' (1924), 'Deuteronomy: The Framework to the Code' (1932), and 'Prophet and Priest in Old Israel' (1936). While not fundamental to the thesis maintained in the three earlier books, this latest work is to be welcomed as giving a further illustration of the general position. It may, however, be remarked that, while most readers have probably made up their minds as to the validity of the arguments stated in the three books mentioned, Dr. Welch's main conclusions on *Chronicles* are not wholly incompatible with the 'regnant hypothesis' as to the date and origin of Deuteronomy. He believes that there are two main strands in the book as we have it now. One is based on the record in Samuel and Kings, which it modifies and amplifies when dealing with the Temple and its services, and is a product of the Palestinian community of the Exilic period. The other is the work of a reviser or annotator, and consists of passages which 'do not form a continuous narrative of the kingdom, since they are entirely absent from some of the reigns.' The reviser's purpose was to bring the book 'into agreement with a different view of the Temple' from that held by the original author. This strand is to be observed especially in the accounts of reforming kings like Hezekiah and Josiah. Neither writer aimed at producing history in the strict sense of the term; each was primarily concerned with his view of the Temple and of its services. But, while the one ascribed the whole ecclesiastical and liturgical system to David, the other held that it went back to Moses, and was simply transferred by David from the tabernacle to the Temple. The two differ, also, in their treatment of the ark and the tabernacle. The evidence which has led Dr. Welch to this conclusion is carefully sifted and discussed. The text of the relevant sections in *Chronicles* is subjected to minute and searching inquiry, sometimes resulting in important original contributions to exegesis and textual criticism. Several aspects of the subject are especially handled; the chapters on the chronicler's attitude to prophecy, to the Levites and to Deuteronomy are particularly illuminating. Fully to appreciate the force of Dr. Welch's reasoning, it is necessary to follow him verse by verse, Bible in hand, through the sections which he discusses in detail, and a final judgment cannot be reached without close discussion of every point raised. But it is certain that in these lectures Dr. Welch has made a contribution which must influence deeply all future discussion of *Chronicles*.

THEORIES OF THOUGHT.

The theologian or theological student who would like to be provided with solid distraction and to receive a strong mental stimulus might well turn to a notable psychological and philosophical study by Dr. Brand Blanshard, Professor of Philosophy, Swarthmore College. It is entitled, *The Nature of Thought* (Allen & Unwin; 2 vols. 32s. net). Professor Blanshard is not only a philosopher of critical insight and constructive power; he also possesses a clear and pointed style and a happy knack of illustration.

The first section, 'Thought in Perception,' deals with the nature, structure, and functions of percep-

tual meaning. The second section, 'Theory of the Idea,' reaches the notion of idea as unrealized purpose after a critical survey of behaviourist, pragmatic, realistic, and other theories. The third section, 'The Movement of Reflection,' treats of such subjects as observation and invention and the tests of truth, coherence being represented as both the test and the nature of truth. It is explained that 'Perfect coherence would mean the necessitation of each part by each and all of the others.' The fourth and final section, 'The Goal of Thought,' expounds and appraises the views of empiricism, formalism, and logical positivism as to the meaning of necessity, concluding with an exposition of the author's own standpoint of 'concrete necessity and internal relations.'

This is the climactic section of the work, and it reveals the author's real interest in his subject to be philosophical rather than merely psychological. He cannot accept the empirical view of necessity as habit, as mere strength of old association. Nor can he accept the formalist view of it as a form sharply distinct from matter, a necessity that may be complete in an abstract system. Nor, again, can he accept the view of it as an arbitrary linguistic convention of our own, which is the view of logical positivism.

In his opinion the world which thought is called upon to construe should be represented as a world of the concrete universal and concrete necessity and of internal relations, that is, as a system of parts such that none can be or be known without the others. Only when thus conceived can it be spoken of as an intelligible world.

Professor Blanshard points out that his theory only restates with variations an ancient doctrine of 'the great tradition,' of *philosophia perennis*, that of the autonomy and objectivity of reason; 'through different minds one intelligible world is in course of construction or reconstruction.' He would like to think that his insistent and reiterated emphasis on the membership of minds in one intelligible order may serve, however minutely, to confirm the belief in a common reason, and the hope and faith that in the end despite present threatenings common reason will prevail.

One cannot but remark on the useful detailed analysis, in the table of contents, of the argument of the book. Indeed, the author has spared no pains in the effort to aid the reader. It is a pity that a work so carefully written and arranged should be marred by some mis-spellings, such as 'coherance' and 'beleif.'

THE LEGACY OF A VANISHED HAND.

Many will turn with interest to a posthumous volume from the pen of that distinguished Scottish churchman and theologian, W. P. Paterson, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh—*Conversion* (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net).

In a felicitous Preface by Principal W. A. Curtis, an admiring pupil and intimate friend of the late Professor Paterson, it is explained that when leisure, all too brief, came to Professor Paterson he turned upon the theme of this book 'the energies of heart and intellect which age had touched so lightly.' And it is well said in the Preface that in the study now published 'there are evidenced the same fascination before the pageant of history, the same respect for the natural variety of religious thought and experience, and the same unshaken loyalty to evangelical faith, which characterized his "Rule of Faith" and "Nature of Religion".' To this we should like to add, the same balanced scholarship, the same care in documentation, the same skill in generalization, and the same power of penetrative analysis.

In this study of 'the remaking of souls' Professor Paterson travels over a wide field, at the same time seeking to set his expositions in historical perspective. Indeed, over so wide a field that the expositions tend at times to become summary in form. None the less he finds room for many personal judgments, on subjects so varied as, for example, baptism, the invocation of saints, the monastic life, and the ethics of Nietzsche.

Beginning with an account and estimate of the anticipations of Christian versions in Brahmanism and Buddhism, in the Greek Mystery religions and Stoicism, and in the Old Testament, the book proceeds to a review of Christian conversion as recorded in the ministry of Jesus, in the Primitive Church, and in Catholicism and Evangelical Protestantism. Then follows an inquiry as to what Philosophy and Psychology have made of conversion, the whole discussion terminating with a pronouncement on the recent situation, in which the call to conversion is represented as once more an urgent duty of the Church.

Professor Paterson draws a suggestive parallel between the contemporary world and certain features of the Græco-Roman world at the beginning of the Christian era. The two ages are ages of religious unsettlement and moral disintegration, and in our age there has been a corresponding reproduction of the materialism and hedonism and,

in particular, the Cæsarism that were so prevalent in the days of the Roman Empire. If the Christian Church is to cope with the new situation it must still hold the substance of its early message, which proved so effectual in quickening souls to newness of life, and must again be known to the world as a school of Christlike character.

The book ends with a prophetic message of hope, the tones of which echo the evangelical loyalty which is sustained throughout: 'The paganizing movement of the Renaissance was overwhelmed by the spiritual fervour of the Reformation, the worldliness and the unbelief of the eighteenth century were shamed and checked by a far-reaching evangelical revival, and there is reason to hope for another baptism with the Holy Ghost and with fire which will revive the sense of God, and the felt need of God, enthrone the Saviour in penitent and believing hearts, and also awaken a zeal for some palpable form of self-denying service of God. . . . It may be that the distinctive feature of the next revival will be the baptism of Christian masses with the spirit of brotherly love, so that it will become for many a second nature to follow the example of Him who cared not for Himself but was in the world as one that served.'

THE BOOK OF JOB.

The Challenge of Calamity is the title which the Rev. S. Nowell-Rostron, M.A., B.D., has adopted for his study of the Book of Job (Lutterworth Press; 7s. 6d. net). His treatment justifies his choice, and as he traces the story and the dialogue our attention is constantly attracted to the main theme. In form the book is a running commentary, which, especially in the latter part, is sometimes little more than a paraphrase. At other times, however, Mr. Nowell-Rostron breaks away from the actual text, and offers us some of the rich treasure of his own thought. Without in any way attempting to detract from the high merits of the book as a whole, a few criticisms may be offered. The author is to some extent hampered by his inability to accept the critical history of Job as presented, shall we say, by such a scholar as Duhm. The Elihu speeches, for example, seem more than ever intrusive in this exposition, and we are left wondering why Job, who had silenced three of the friends, had no answer for the fourth. The ascription of the framework and of the poem to the same author is less serious, because even the 'critical' hypothesis assumes that the poet had before him the story in the form in which he used its beginning and its end, and deliberately wrote in such a way as to fit his poem into it. Mr. Nowell-Rostron does not emphasize, as he might have done, the influence of the friends on the progress of Job's thought. Chapter 3 is simply a cry of pain; the *problem* does not arise till Eliphaz insists that Job's sufferings are imposed by God as retribution or as discipline. Bildad appeals to divine 'justice,' and thenceforward the forensic metaphor is one of the leading *motifs* of the book. The progress of Job's thought is not clearly traced—'Is God my enemy? No; despite all appearances, He is, in the last analysis, my friend. How can He prove this, since I am doomed to a brief life of hopeless suffering and a miserable death? Death is not the end of His dealings with me. Even so, how can I state my case before Him, seeing that I cannot find Him? Let me at least prepare it, and make a last appeal.' And so God comes. Again, not a few readers will greatly appreciate the sympathetic treatment of Eliphaz, but will feel that Job's own position does not always receive full justice. Is there, in all literature, a more terrible irony or a more ruthless exposure of the futility inherent in a merely conventional theology than that which is presented by the first speech of Eliphaz? But, even if the reader feels that in these respects (and possibly others) Mr. Nowell-Rostron's treatment might have been different, he will admit the author's right to his opinion, and will freely recognize the high value of the work for homiletic purposes. Mr. Nowell-Rostron is a Professor of Pastoral Theology, and it may fairly be claimed that he has been more successful than any of his predecessors in helping the working parson to expound one of the greatest monuments of religious literature.

THE FUTURE LIFE.

A fascinating book on the question of immortality and the questions this raises in the inquiring mind has been written by the Rev. C. J. Shebbeare, D.D., *The Problem of the Future Life* (Shakespeare Head Press, Oxford; 2s. 6d. net). Dr. Shebbeare has been lecturer on Comparative Religion in Oxford University and president of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology. He was also a member of the Archbishops' Commission on Doctrine. The present book is introduced in a very eulogistic Preface by Dr. W. R. Matthews. So we are disposed to listen to the writer with some expectation. And such an attitude will be well rewarded in the event. Just here and there the writer becomes a little difficult, when he mounts his metaphysical steed. But for

the most part he is quite easy to follow. And his argument, generally and in detail, is both helpful and refreshing.

He starts from firm ground by facing the apologetic question, our grounds for believing in a future life. And happily he connects such a belief closely with our belief in God. But he adds (perhaps it is not really an addition) considerations such as the rationality and also the incompleteness of the universe. All this is very interesting. But the author takes us much further. He faces the problem of the nature of the future life. Shall we have a body? Shall we know one another? Will everybody be saved?

THE SPIRIT OF LIFE.

There are manifest evidences of a recovery of faith and apostolic energy within the Church. After the stunning blow of the World War and the bewildering years which followed it—years when not merely Christian doctrines but the very foundations of morality seemed to be submerged, the Church is showing signs of regaining her foothold, and is beginning to say again with Hopeful, 'I feel the bottom and it is good.'

Take as one example of this *The Spirit of Life*, by the Rev. D. H. C. Read, B.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). The writer is a young minister of promise who has a mind and a style of his own. He is perhaps a little too fond of being epigrammatic and his metaphors occasionally get mixed, but he has something to say and he can say it in a fresh and arresting way.

His theme in general is the relevance of the gospel to the crisis of to-day. In his exposition the influence of Karl Barth is manifest. Naturalistic optimism is gone and we are compelled to take a more tragic view of human nature than the Modernist does. Indeed, the sin of man is such as to require the view that its origin is in some sense supernatural. In a bold and striking chapter, entitled 'The Devil comes back,' Mr. Read deals with this. The sovereignty of God stands in need of reassertion, and in the mystery of the Cross the Living God is revealed in the Dying Lord.

In the light of all this the division of the Church and of Christian groups, the varieties of theological thought, and the centrality of the Word of God are surveyed in a sympathetic, if critical, spirit. The whole book is brief but compact with good matter, and fuller treatment of the topics here discussed will be welcomed from the writer's pen.

Of *Three Ways of Thought in Ancient China* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net) it is enough to say that its contents have been selected and translated by Mr. Arthur Waley. That fact gives assurance that in this book we shall find expert guidance to the ideas, profound and shrewd and full of a quaint and characteristic humour, of some of China's sages. To enjoy it—and especially the extracts from *Chuang Tzu*—needs no philosophic learning but an interest in human nature. It is hardly surprising that such a story as that of Confucius and the Brigand Chief has always shocked Confucianists, for it might be held to teach the futility of moral exhortation. The final story in this section is said to have been 'quoted at the treasury by the representatives of the Chinese Government who came to England to raise a loan in 1938.' The representatives of the Treasury did not see how it was relevant—or did they just not want to see?

The third part of the book deals with Chinese realists and the ideas of some of them are so parallel to 'Totalitarianism' that, Mr. Waley says, 'the reader will wonder whether they are not cuttings from a current newspaper.' Here we have 'power politics' described in its most extreme form. But we find elsewhere as well a quietism that is at the farthest extreme from aggression and requires that we become 'like an inanimate object.' 'A clod of earth cannot lose its way.' There are few 'ways of thought' that men have ever explored in any age that have not come under the scrutiny of the shrewd old eyes of China.

The Rev. S. K. George, M.A., B.D., is a great Gandhi-ite. Whether Mr. George is a great Christian is more open to question. Of his sincerity there is no doubt. For he, an Indian Christian, has suffered for the faith, so we are told. And he believes that he has something vital to say, and says it with passion and conviction in *Gandhi's Challenge to Christianity* (Allen & Unwin; 3s. 6d. net).

It is a plea for translating Christianity into Indian thinking, so that India may be able to hear the Christan faith in its own mental speech. For obviously, just as the one Eternal Gospel must, if it is to win its way, be preached in English in Britain, in French in France, in German in Germany; and must be translated into the accent of each new age; so India can only hear Christ if that Christ be preached to it in Indian ways—an admirable idea, grown familiar, even platitudinous by now, in theory, though still immensely difficult to put in practice. For we remember how grievously Chris-

tianity has been burdened and handicapped in Europe because semi-converted nations brought in too much of their old faiths along with them; and that it has always been the policy of Hinduism never to challenge and confront its rivals, but to accept as much of this new faith as would satisfy those Hindus who were looking towards it, absorb that, and then cast the rest away. So it conquered Buddhism; so it has tried to vanquish Muhammadanism; and so it now seeks to outwit Christianity. And Mr. George seems willing to play dangerously far into its hands.

There is a shrill little Preface by Radhakrishnan.

The publishers seem to anticipate that this small book might make a stir in missionary circles, and in the home churches. We fear they may be disappointed.

Since Professor A. B. Bruce wrote 'The Training of the Twelve,' which was first published as long ago as 1871, there have been few books dealing explicitly with that subject, and none to equal his. Of course the subject is touched upon more or less fully in all books about Jesus, and they are legion. A fresh attempt to cover the ground is made in *With the Twelve*, by the Rev. Dr. Carl. A. Glover (Cokesbury Press; $2.00). The writer divides his book into two parts. In the first he deals with the training of the Twelve as a whole, following in general the order of events as related by St. Mark. In the second part he takes the disciples one by one and endeavours to paint a portrait of each. The execution of the work gives evidence of close and reverent study of the Gospel narratives, sound exegesis and a high degree of skill in character painting.

A very thoughtful and closely reasoned account of religious experience is given by Mr. A. Victor Murray, M.A., B.Litt., Professor of Education in the University College, Hull, in *Personal Experience and the Historic Faith* (Epworth Press; 6s. net). It is difficult to give any brief account of an argument which is so carefully knit together. But, very generally, Professor Murray takes the spirit of man as looking out on the universe through limitations which in some degree hinder his spiritual vision and also in some degree aid it. He is dependent on history, but he does break through time and space to an immediate experience of God. He sees God in beauty and order. He sees Him in events and persons, above all in Jesus Christ. But he can, and does, penetrate for himself through all this, and by meditation and love reaches a personal life in God through and with Christ.

The three parts of the book are entitled 'The Natural Man and the Spiritual World,' 'Experience and History,' and 'The Christian Man.' In the third there is a full analysis of Christian experience as a witness to divine reality. Christian experience is expounded in successive chapters as coming through feeling, knowing, choosing, doing, and belonging. What will perhaps attract readers to this book is the way in which the writer brings together the experience of history and the immediacy of faith. It is an interesting book and, to all who are concerned about the 'problem' it presents, a rewarding one.

In *The Old Testament and its Message* (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net) the Rev. A. Lewis Humphries offers lay preachers and teachers an introduction to the Old Testament. He covers nearly all the ground, omitting only a few books, and suggests the place which different parts of the Old Testament took in the progress of divine revelation. He writes simply and clearly, handling his material in a devotional spirit, and bringing out plainly what the inspiration of Scripture means to him. The book may well be useful to those for whom it is intended, but (as Mr. Humphries realizes) they will need further study. In this connexion it may be remarked that the list of books recommended is the one blemish in the volume. Five out of the ten books named are out of print, and probably unobtainable by many students, and Mr. Humphries owes Dr. Wheeler Robinson a very humble apology for ascribing to him a book whose authorship he would certainly repudiate!

Bishop Francis J. McConnell, of the American Methodist Church, has written a moving and discerning book on the founder of Methodism in his *John Wesley* (Epworth Press; 10s. 6d. net). It was published some months ago by the Abingdon Press and a notice of it appeared in this magazine at that time. It is rather a series of ten studies on the most notable aspects of Wesley's life and work than a biography in the strict sense, although it follows the main outlines of his career, and presents a virile picture of his personality. The successive chapters treat such themes as 'The Brand plucked from the Burning,' 'The Heart strangely Warmed,' 'The Peculiar Talent,' 'The Defender of the Faith,' 'Towards Methodism's Independence,' 'Spreading Social Righteousness.' The book reveals a close study of the literature of the subject and is a

distinct contribution to our knowledge and understanding of Wesley and the social and religious conditions of his time. It is refreshing to see greater justice done to Samuel Wesley and to read a saner and more discriminating judgment on John's 'love-affairs.' Perhaps there is less sympathy with Wesley's attitude to the Church of England than recent discussions have led us to expect, but, on the other hand, the long chapter on 'Spreading Social Righteousness' brings out the greatness of this aspect of his work. 'Wesley's thinking,' says Bishop McConnell, 'was personal but also institutional, realistic as well as spiritual, administrative as well as absorbed in the inner life, more deeply and highly ethical than most of the romanticists.' No student of the Methodist Movement should miss this important work.

The Book of Daniel is naturally popular to-day, and numbers of people will be glad of any light that can be thrown on it. A modern application of its eternal message may be found in the work of a Swiss Pastor, Walther Lüthi, whose exegetical sermons on the book have now been published in English under the title *The Church to Come* (Hodder and Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). At the head of each sermon is printed the passage to be expounded (it would have been better to use distinctive type for this purpose), and the running comment follows. The author is aware of the fact that much work has been done on the book in modern times, but makes little use of it; he retains, for example, the familiar but wholly misleading translation in 2^5, 'The thing is gone from me.' For his purpose, however, his failure to employ recent studies is of comparatively little moment, for he is concerned to extract and to apply to modern conditions the permanent truths enshrined in the book. Here he has succeeded admirably, and it is impossible not to be impressed by his humility, his boldness, and his evangelical zeal. His example might profitably be followed by Christian preachers in any church.

The Rev. S. Pearce Carey, M.A., is widely known as the author of an interesting biography of his great-grandfather, the famous missionary. In that book he showed that he had the gift of writing with skill and imagination. He has now written an account of our Lord's earthly life, under the simple title of *Jesus* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). The story is unfolded under five main divisions—the Beginnings, the Doings, and Teachings, the Approaching Sufferings, the Sufferings, and the New Beginnings. Each division contains a large number of brief sections, every section giving an account of some incident or significant word. These sections are all headed with captions, more or less felicitous. Full use is made of the Fourth Gospel, the historicity of which the writer cordially accepts, and which he skilfully weaves into his narrative. In view of this and of the writer's full acceptance of the miraculous element in the Gospels it is surprising that he omits without explanation the stories of the Annunciation, the Shepherds and the Angels' Song. The writer at times gives somewhat too free rein to his imagination, as when he represents John as pursuing Judas out of the Upper Room but losing sight of him in the dark. The whole narrative, however, makes very fresh and interesting reading, and breathes a spirit at once sane and devout.

A new study of the Lord's Prayer has been made by the Rev. D. W. Langridge, M.A.—*The Politics of the Kingdom* (Independent Press; 3s. 6d. net). The author holds that our conventional and pietistic interpretations of Christ's teaching miss a good deal of His real meaning. As a matter of fact, he contends, if we take the Lord's Prayer just as it stands, and put aside familiar ways of reading it, we shall find that it has serious and definite social implications. It implies a fellowship, a new morality, a democracy. It challenges colour, race, privilege, and other pillars of our present system. It could only be acceptably offered by a community established as a real brotherhood. Only as this political aspect of the prayer is allowed can we hope to penetrate to its depths. The Lord's Prayer is a political manifesto. It is this that justifies us in speaking of the 'Politics' of the Kingdom. From this point of view the exposition proceeds. It must not be supposed that the author is a fire brand. He writes sensibly and with restraint, and by no means ignores the spiritual side of his subject. His book will be a suggestive aid both to the understanding and exposition of the Prayer.

That admirable little book, *Some Sayings of the Buddha: According to the Pāli Canon*, translated by Mr. F. L. Woodward (Milford; 2s. net), has now been given a place in 'The World's Classics.' And it entirely deserves it. There is no finer or handier collection of the main and central things in Buddhism, none so convenient in size, so prettily brought out, and so inviting to slip into one's pocket. It has not the fullness of, say, Warren's 'Buddhism in Translation.' But that invaluable

book is bulky. This other is the very thing lovers of Buddha can squeeze into a corner of a suitcase, or have lying beside their bed. And beginners, reading it, will make straight towards the heart of Buddhism by one of the shortest tracks to that there is.

Teacher Training in the Sunday School is a promising title for a book that is most urgently needed. It has been written by two experienced teachers, Mary D. Burnie and Fanny Hindle (National Sunday School Union ; 2s. 6d. net). The authors' aim is to make practical use of their own experience of many years for the guidance of those who have not had much opportunity for equipping themselves adequately for their task. The book deals in turn with the Primary Department, the Junior Department, and the Intermediate and Senior Conferences, as well as with Teacher Training Outside the Training Class. These two ladies have a very high ideal, and do not flinch from carrying it out the full length. It would be a wonderful thing to find all their demands fully met anywhere. Perhaps they are. At any rate, they know what they want and what should be found everywhere. And the ideal they sketch will be found a stimulus to endeavour, and a good working standard.

There have been many 'Bible Handbooks,' and in every generation there is room for at least one new one. Such a book should deal with the general background of the Bible, including archæology and geography, the history, political and religious, which it reveals and illustrates, the structure of its various parts, and an outline of the positive teaching it has to convey. It should be adapted for use both as a text-book and as a minor work of reference, combining a high degree of accuracy with wide knowledge of the subject. Many of these qualities are to be observed in *Essentials of Bible History*, by Professor Elmer W. K. Mould, of Elmira College (Nelson ; 15s. net). The arrangement is admirable, and as the reader passes steadily on from primitive times down to the early centuries of the Christian Church, his attention is directed to the history, religion, and literature of each period in turn. Apparently Professor Mould does not claim to be a first-hand authority ; he refers constantly to standard works—chiefly American. Sometimes his statements need to be checked by reference to his authorities ; for example, his dates for the ninth century B.C. need revision, and a writer familiar with Hebrew would hardly speak of the absolute and construct 'cases' (cf. p. 306). He might with advantage have made more extended use of European work, both British and Continental. He gives no sign of acquaintance with the important works of Eissfeldt and Hempel on Old Testament literature ; in dealing with the religious background of the New Testament he should have used Glover's book as well as that of Professor Case, and any modern discussion of the Synoptic problem must take into account Streeter's work, to say nothing of 'form-criticism.' It is to be hoped that the book may be revised, corrected, and brought up-to-date, for it is duly proportioned and well-balanced, and might prove a really valuable contribution to our literature on the Bible. It remains only to add that Professor Mould writes (very properly) in the American rather than in the English language.

In *Wonders of Prophecy* (Pickering & Inglis ; 2s. 6d. net), by Mr. John Urquhart, now issued in a new edition, we have what the sub-title calls 'The Testimony of Fulfilled Prediction to the Inspiration of the Bible.' It deals with the statements of the prophets regarding Tyre and Sidon, Egypt, Edom, Philistia, Judah and Israel, Babylonia, the Advent of Christ, and the Jewish race, and endeavours to show on Fundamentalist lines that, as the Old Testament predictions regarding these have been fulfilled, the Bible must be the Word of God. It is a pity that the evidential value of prophecy should be treated on such a narrow basis. Undoubtedly, the conception of a living God in moral and spiritual contact with His prophets involves an element of prediction, and it would be a serious mistake to underestimate this fact. But the author lays an excessive and almost exclusive stress on this element, as if the term 'prophecy' in the Old Testament were synonymous with 'prediction.' He overlooks the fact that the main function of the prophets had to do with their own age. They were chiefly great moral and religious teachers, especially in relation to the duties of national life. They were forth-tellers rather than fore-tellers. In analysing their intuitions of the future and laying them before the people, they nearly always presented them in the form of a moral syllogism (cf. Mic $3^{9ff.}$, Is $5^{11ff.}$). Everywhere the menacing future is connected with the evil past by *therefore* (cf. Am 1, 2). The whole question of the prophetic office is a very complicated one, necessitating deep scholarship for its proper understanding. Whether this book, which endeavours to prove the Divine origin of Scripture by simply comparing detailed prediction with detailed fulfilment, and thus exhibiting a miracle of foreknowledge, will

help Christian Apologetics is, to say the least, doubtful. At the same time, as it is clearly written and well illustrated, it should commend itself to those who accept the author's standpoint and his theory of inspiration.

Professor Douglas Clyde Macintosh of Yale, having set out to write a book on 'Religion for To-day and To-morrow,' has found his material so expanded that he now contemplates three volumes. The first of these has been issued under the title of *Social Religion* (Scribner's; 10s. 6d. net), and the writer hopes to follow it up with two other volumes, on 'Personal Religion' and 'Theology.' Whether this expansion is altogether wise may be doubted. The order of the main topics is somewhat unusual, and no doubt is significant as indicating where the writer's chief interest lies. The volume before us falls into two very distinct parts. The former, dealing with the Principles of Social Religion, consists of an elaborate and careful study of New Testament teaching about the Kingdom of God and the Social Content of the Gospel. The second deals with such problems as War, Poverty, Liberty of Conscience, and Civil Government. Here the reader is treated to a great deal of contemporary American politics in the thick of which it is not always easy to see the wood for the trees. The writer, a Canadian who has resided in the U.S.A. for thirty-three years without being able to become a naturalized citizen owing to certain scruples of conscience, offers the excuse that 'this overgrown volume is the abnormal expression of my repressed (or suppressed) desire to vote!' However interesting this may be from the personal point of view it does overload the book. All the same we have here the mature thoughts of a careful student of the Gospels who endeavours to bring the teaching of Jesus to bear upon the social problems of to-day. As such it is to be warmly commended as worthy of study.

A series of lessons for Youth Groups and Bible Classes has been edited by the Rev. J. R. Lumb, M.A., and published by the S.P.C.K., *The Living Gospel* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). There are eight divisions with forty-six lessons in all. 'God's Purpose in History' leads on to five lessons on Amos and six on the Sermon on the Mount. 'The Holy Eucharist' is a transition to some lessons on the devotional life. 'Christian Unity' follows, with a section on Science and Religion, and the book closes with six lessons on the Apostles' Creed. There are eight writers, who all appear competent for their work. The lessons are well done in every case, and we would specially commend the Rev. T. H. H. Kilborn for the insight and breadth of mind with which he has treated the difficult subject of Christian Unity. Altogether a useful book.

The Eternal Voice is the title which the Rev. Leslie D. Weatherhead has given to his latest volume of sermons (S.C.M.; 5s. net). For this expresses his aim in preaching—that the hearer, and now the reader, may catch some message of the eternal voice and respond to it. The sermons are published just as they were preached in the City Temple, or with only the most minor alterations. Each is prefaced by a reading and a prayer, and at the end of the volume—a new idea this surely—is a questionary. Mr. Weatherhead hopes that this will make the book of more use and of more interest to discussion groups. We have given the first sermon, in an abridged form, in 'The Christian Year' this month. Among the questions for discussion on this sermon are: 'What is our answer to those who say that there is no meaning or significance in life, and who regard what we label purpose as purely accidental?' and 'Is the message of man's moral capability only possible because of the measure of his power to do evil? And does this throw light on the problem of why God allows such terrible evils in His world?'

In one of the broadcast talks which have been collected to form the volume *Love in Action* (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net) Dr. E. S. Woods tells the story of the young Communist in China who, as he was led out to his death, challenged his captors with the searching question, 'I am dying for Communism; what are you living for?' It would not be amiss to think of this book as Dr. Woods' answer, for it tells of God's love in action in Christ, and of the life of love for His fellows as the Christian is called to live it. It will be found that the addresses—there are twenty-two in all—simple and easy as they seemed to be when they came to us over the air, will stand reading and re-reading. The Bishop of Lichfield faces the problems of modern life and thought, and he lights up all the points he discusses by the variety of his reading. His sincerity is impressive. This is one of the smaller books which should not be overlooked this Christmas.

Great Texts Reconsidered.

Matthew xi. 25–27 = Luke x. 21, 22.

By N. P. Williams, D.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford.

The close similarity between the versions of this great Saying preserved by Matthew and Luke respectively approaches so nearly to verbal identity that the text may conveniently be exhibited in the form of a reprint of the Matthæan passage, the Lucan variants being noted in brackets where they occur.

ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς (Lk. ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἠγαλλιάσατο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ) εἶπεν·

ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἔκρυψας (Lk. ἀπέκρυψας) ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν, καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις· ναὶ ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο (Lk. ἐγένετο εὐδοκία) ἔμπροσθέν σου.

(Lk. καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εἶπεν·)

πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει (Lk. γινώσκει) τὸν υἱὸν (Lk. τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς) εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει (Lk. καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ πατὴρ) εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.

No textual variations of any serious importance are given by the MSS. or other authorities, apart from the reversed order in which some early writers quote the last two clauses of the second Logion ('No man knoweth the Father save the Son . . . no man knoweth the Son save the Father').

I. Any discussion of the meaning and the authenticity of the Sayings themselves must be preceded by some inquiry into the mutually interrelated questions of the occasion on which and the context in which they were, or are alleged to have been, pronounced, of the source from which Matthew and Luke derived them, and of the relative degrees of fidelity with which the Evangelists respectively have reproduced that source. The second of these problems need not occupy us long, because it is generally agreed that, occurring as they do with such striking verbal similarity in Matthew and Luke but not in Mark, the Sayings are indubitably derived from Q; nor need the third detain us, as it seems most probable that the minute points in which Luke differs from Matthew (especially the substitution of the indirect questions τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς . . . ὁ πατήρ for the blunt accusatives τὸν υἱὸν . . . τὸν πατέρα) are conscious stylistic improvements. The question of the precise occasion to which the utterance of the Sayings should be assigned is one to which, in the light of our modern conception of the Synoptic Gospels as largely pieced together out of independent *pericopae*, of which the present sequence in our Gospels was determined by devotional and literary rather than scientifically historical considerations, it seems less and less possible to give a definite answer. In St. Matthew's Gospel the Sayings are assigned to the Galilean period of our Lord's Ministry, and follow immediately upon the woes pronounced upon Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum; but too much cannot be built upon this, even if we confine ourselves to the task of reconstructing the intentions of St. Matthew; for the phrase with which he introduces the first Saying ('At that season Jesus answered and said') is a vague, colourless, and conventional formula, which cannot be taken to convey any real indication of the chronological relation of what follows to what precedes it. Much more important is the fact that, in Matthew's version alone, the two Sayings which are reproduced by Luke are followed by a third, penetrated by the same tone of mystical exaltation, but drawing a practical conclusion from the concluding clause of the second Logion ('Neither doth any know the Father,' etc., which affirms the Son to be the sole revealer of the Father) and con-

sequently appearing to be organically bound up with it. This is the wonderful invitation (vv.[28-30]):

δεῦτε πρός με, πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι, κἀγὼ ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς· ἄρατε τὸν ζυγόν μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, καὶ μάθετε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ὅτι πρᾳΰς εἰμι καὶ ταπεινός τῇ καρδίᾳ· καὶ εὑρήσετε ἀνάπαυσιν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν· ὁ γὰρ ζυγός μου χρηστός, καὶ τὸ φορτίον μου ἐλαφρόν ἐστιν.

That this is regarded by Matthew as forming part of the same *pericope* is shown by the fact that, immediately after it, the conventional phrase 'At that season' is once more employed in order to introduce a new paragraph (12[1]). Luke's setting of these Logia is quite different. He places the occasion of their utterance in the course of his 'Travel-Section' (9[51]–18[14]), immediately after the triumphant return of the Seventy, with their story of victory over the demons. The impression produced by a perusal of the Lucan version is that it was this triumph over the spiritual forces of wickedness which produced in Jesus the state of exalted joy from which this cry of jubilation (*Der Jubelruf*, as German scholars call it) proceeded (though the statement that Jesus 'rejoiced in the Holy Spirit' is probably an inference from the character of the Saying which it introduces, just as the note that He 'turned to His disciples' is probably an editorial inference from the character of the second Saying). Moreover, the sequel of the Sayings in St. Luke's Gospel is, not the invitation 'Come unto me' addressed to suffering humanity in general, but a private felicitation of His disciples in particular—'Blessed are the eyes that see the things that ye see,' etc. (Lk 10[23. 24]); this (with slight variations) occurs in St. Matthew's Gospel, but in a totally different context (Mt 13[16. 17]—the explanation of the *rationale* of parabolic teaching, and of the Parable of the Sower). It is clear that Matthew and Luke cannot both be right (in a strictly historical sense) with regard to the setting in which they have placed these Logia; the impression, indeed, borne in upon us by the facts just set out is that neither of them can claim (or, most probably, intended to claim) exact objectivity for the precise chronological location in which he has placed the text. Though we must remember that we are not entitled to speak in terms of dogmatic certitude but only in those of very high probability, we must conclude, for the purposes of this inquiry, that the Logia originally existed, during the oral stage of the transmission of the Dominical Logia, and were subsequently embodied in Q, as an independent, self-contained *pericope*, not attached to any particular event; and that Matthew and Luke have severally inserted it into those contexts which seemed to them appropriate, without any strictly historical warrant, such as would be required by a modern biographer, for so doing. Given the editorial methods of ancient historians, this conclusion does not involve, in the case of either Evangelist, any accusation of consciously falsifying history. Our typographical device of separating paragraphs by a line of dots, in order to show that they are printed as independent paragraphs and not necessarily exhibited as having any logical or historical connexion one with the other, was not known to ancient scribes; but, if it had been, it might well have been employed by Matthew to indicate that he does not mean to assert that there was any close chronological connexion between the utterance of the woes upon the Galilean cities and the utterance of the *Jubelruf*, and by Luke to show that he is giving us three separate incidents (*a*) the return of the Seventy, (*b*) the utterance of the *Jubelruf*, and (*c*) the felicitation of the disciples, all of which really occurred, but without committing himself to the implied assertion that they occurred in that particular order, or in immediate chronological contiguity.

II. It would seem, then, that we must renounce the attempt to find a precise setting for these Logia; they come to the modern student as an isolated excerpt from Q, without any indication of the time at which or the circumstances under which they were spoken, apart from the fact that the first Logion implies that some, at least, had accepted our Lord's message; from which it may be inferred that the Saying was not uttered (or, if it is unauthentic, does not claim to have been uttered) until our Lord's public Ministry had lasted for some considerable time. Many will, doubtless, feel that the contents of the text are so sublime that our ignorance of the precise situation which called it forth involves

little loss, at any rate in the devotional sphere. But we are now faced by a question which has an intimate bearing upon the ultimate problems of the authenticity of the Sayings and of the doctrinal import to be assigned to them. This is the question of the connexion with the two Logia which are reproduced both by Matthew and by Luke of the third Logion (the invitation to the weary and heavy laden), which appears in Matthew only and not in Luke. Did our Lord's prophetic cry appear in Q as a hymn of three strophes, of which Matthew has faithfully reproduced all, whilst Luke has suppressed the last? Or is the Lucan, two-strophe version the original one, to which Matthew has added the 'Invitation,' derived by him from some other source?

It does not seem possible to decide this question by any *a priori* considerations of the relative degrees of exactitude with which Matthew and Luke are accustomed to reproduce Q. For that is a subject on which agreement does not at present appear to exist amongst scholars. C. F. Burney[1] thinks that Matthew, being a Rabbinist, would naturally attach great importance to the literal reproduction of the exact words of a great teacher, whilst Luke, being of a more Hellenic and therefore more philosophical turn of mind would attach primary importance to the meaning, and would permit himself a greater liberty in regard to the verbal form. Streeter,[2] on the other hand, thinks that Luke is the more faithful follower of Q, both in respect of order and of literal form. The question can, therefore, only be solved by a consideration of the contents of the three Matthæan Logia, in order to decide whether the third is so intimately connected with the first two that it must be deemed always to have constituted a single organic whole with them.

This problem is the subject of a minute and laborious investigation by the German scholar Eduard Norden,[3] in his treatise on the forms assumed by religious addresses and harangues in the mystical, theosophical, and magical literature of the Hellenized Orient during the centuries immediately preceding and following the birth of Christ. One of these forms he finds to be the revelational ῥῆσις, or solemn, impassioned speech, which normally consists of three members, namely, (*a*) Assertion that the speaker has received, or is the unique vehicle of, a revelation; (*b*) Thanksgiving for the revelation so imparted; (*c*) Appeal to mankind to submit themselves to the speaker's instruction, and so to secure for themselves the benefits of the revelation. The revelation is naturally and usually described as 'wisdom' (σοφία) or 'knowledge' (γνῶσις); it is to be observed that, from the instances of such ῥήσεις which he quotes, Norden concludes that the order (*a*) (*b*) (*c*) is not absolutely fixed, but may be varied at the discretion of the speaker or author. The earliest and most typical instance of this he finds in 'The Prayer of Jesus the son of Sirach' which concludes the book which we know as Ecclesiasticus (51). This, according to him, falls into the three divisions just set out, namely, (*a*) a Prayer of Thanksgiving (vv.[1-12]) beginning ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι, κύριε βασιλεῦ (cf. the ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, κ.τ.λ., of our first Logion); (*b*) Assertion that the speaker has after long search attained to wisdom (vv.[13-22]); (*c*) Appeal to the unlearned to accept the speaker's instruction (vv.[23-30]). This, Norden thinks, corresponds roughly to the threefold structure of the ῥῆσις ascribed to Jesus by Matthew. And he draws attention to some verbal similarities in the last strophe of both passages; these may be exhibited as follows:

Sirach.

li. 23. ἐγγίσατε πρὸς μέ, ἀπαίδευτοι . . .
26. τὸν τράχηλον ὑμῶν ὑπόθετε ὑπὸ ζυγόν,
καὶ ἐπιδεξάσθω ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν παιδείαν.

Matthæan Logion.

xi. 28. δεῦτε πρός με πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες . . .
29. ἄρατε τὸν ζυγόν μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς . . .
καὶ εὑρήσετε ἀνάπαυσιν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν.

He does not, however, regard the Matthæan Logion as directly dependent upon the Sirach passage, but thinks that both alike are examples of a common form; which, as Ecclesiasticus must have been written between 190–170 B.C., must

[1] *The Poetry of our Lord* (1925).
[2] *The Four Gospels* (1931), 291.
[3] *Agnostos Theos* (1912), 277–308.

have been of considerable antiquity at the period when the materials of the Gospels were being reduced to written form.

III. Other examples of the 'form' of the three-membered ῥῆσις given by Norden are taken from pagan or syncretistic sources. The most important of these occurs in the *corpus Hermeticum*, lib. i. (*Poimandres*), 31, 32, 27–29 (ed. W. Scott, i. 130 ff.). The three members which Norden discerns in this passage are—(*a*) Praise of God for the impartation of revelation (the hymn beginning 'Holy is God, the Father of all'); (*b*) Claim to possess the revelation at the end of 32—Wherefore I believe and bear witness that I enter into Life and Light: blessed art Thou, Father; Thy Man seeks to share Thy holiness, even as Thou hast given him all authority (καθὼς παρέδωκας αὐτῷ τὴν πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν): (*c*) Appeal to mankind (27, 28—'Hearken ye folk, men born of earth . . . awake to soberness, cease to be sodden with strong drink,' etc.). Norden finds a close parallel between the concluding phrase of (*b*) καθὼς πα ρέδωκας, κ.τ.λ., and the πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου of Matthew, interpreting the verb παραδίδωμι in each case as indicating the 'handing over' of a παράδοσις or 'tradition,'[1] that is, mystical lore or γνῶσις, which, as imparting 'authority' in the spiritual sphere, is in the Hermetic passage described as ἐξουσία. He quotes also a tractate, of which the date is not given, bearing the title 'Isis the prophetess to her son' (*i.e.* Horus). Here, a divine Mother (not Father—but this, according to Norden, is an unessential difference) is represented as imparting the knowledge of all mysteries to her son, who in his turn transmits it to those of mankind who are found worthy to receive it. Reference is also made to the Asclepius of Pseudo-Apuleius, in which the Prayer of Thanksgiving for the revelation comes at the very end of the treatise, after the mystic lore has been expounded 'gratias tibi agimus, summe exsuperantissime. tua enim gratia tantum sumus cognitionis tuae lumen consecuti.'[2] For the claims said to have been made by Oriental prophets or Gnostic adepts, to be 'sons' or 'powers' of God and so depositaries of revelation, Norden compares the formula placed in the mouths of the pagan prophets of Phœnicia and Palestine by Celsus (*ap.* Orig. *c. Cels.* vii. 9)—ἐγὼ ὁ θεός εἰμι ἢ θεοῦ παῖς ἢ πνεῦμα θεῖον: he reminds us of Simon Magus, the Gnostic prophet of Samaria, who, according to Ac 8^{10}, was believed to be the incarnation of 'that power of God which is called Great,' and suggests that some such formula as that caricatured by Celsus may have been the opening phrase of one of his characteristic ῥήσεις. There are also attempts to discover the triple form of the revelational ῥῆσις in the Johannine discourses and the Pauline epistles; these, however, reveal no more than what can at best be called vague traces and echoes of the 'form,' and do not add appreciably to the strength of the argument, such as it is.

IV. It is on the basis of the data just summarized that Norden concludes in favour of the Matthæan, three-membered version of the Logion, including the invitation to the weary and heavy laden, as against the Lucan, two-membered version. It will conduce to clearness if, before subjecting his strictly *formgeschichtliche*[3] argument to a critical examination, we subjoin at this point a summary of this scholar's opinions with regard to the meaning and the asserted Dominical origin of the passage. The first paragraph extols the inscrutable wisdom of God, which has brought it about that the revelation (ταῦτα) has been received by the humble and uninstructed (νήπιοι), and has been rejected by 'the wise and understanding,' whom Norden identifies with the Rabbinical caste. With the substitution of Greek philosophers for Jewish Rabbis, the thought is identical with that of 1 Co 1^{18-25}—'seeing that in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom knew not God, it was God's good pleasure through the foolishness of the preaching to save them that believe.' So far, no one will challenge this exegesis; and there is equally little disagreement as to the significance of the third paragraph of the Logion, the invitation of the weary to receive instruction from the Speaker, coupled with the promise of rest and refreshment

[1] Cf. 1 Co $11^{2.\ 23}$, 15^{3}.

[2] W. Scott, *Hermetica*, i. 374.

[3] Norden uses this adjective of his own researches, writing more than a decade before the application of 'form-criticism' to the Gospels.

to their souls. It is the second paragraph which is the crucial one: and on this the views of our author must be expounded in some detail.

The simple believer, reading the opening words of this paragraph, 'All things have been delivered unto me of my Father,' naturally interprets them as referring to the Messianic rule of the Universe which was already assigned to the Son of Man, in respect of His humanity, by the Father's decree, was destined to be actualized at the Ascension and perfected at the Consummation of all things; he would regard it as identical in content with Mt 28^{18}, 'All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth,' and Jn 3^{35}, 'The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand,' and 13^{3}, 'Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands.' As we have noted above, however, Norden is constrained by his theory of the revelational ῥῆσις, concerned only with the origins of γνῶσις, to reject this interpretation and connect παρεδόθη strictly with the idea of παράδοσις in the technical sense of 'tradition.' The phrase will then mean, 'All my tradition—the whole of my teaching—was revealed to me by the Father; it is not derived from any chain of Rabbinical divines and casuists'; in other words, our Lord here asserts of Himself the judgment which was formulated about Him by His hearers 'He speaketh with authority, and not as the scribes.' It may well be thought in view of the subsequent claim to be 'meek and lowly in heart,' that the speaker intends to classify himself amongst the νήπιοι of v.[25] as contrasted with the Rabbinical σοφοὶ καὶ συνετοί. It is desirable to make it quite clear that, according to Norden, the authority here represented as having been claimed by Jesus is *intellectual* authority only, consisting in a power to impart to others the knowledge which has been revealed to Him by God, and not governmental authority over the Cosmos.

This tradition, or teaching, or γνῶσις, consists in the knowledge of God, which is possessed only by the Son and those to whom the Son chooses to impart it (second paragraph, last clause)—that is, presumably, the νήπιοι of paragraph 1. But what is meant by the second clause of the second paragraph (οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱόν, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ)? Here we come upon the very core of the whole problem. As we have already observed, there is a certain amount of authority in the quotations of this Logion by early Christian writers for reversing the order of this and the following clause, and on the basis of this fact Harnack has founded a case for eliminating as spurious the affirmation that only the Father has full knowledge of the Son.[1] Norden, however, cannot avail himself of this expedient, for the excision of the second clause would destroy the structure of the ῥῆσις, which consists of three stanzas, each of four lines, and the proposed excision would leave the second stanza consisting of three lines only. But he is able to explain the phrase as it stands and in its present place, by invoking the conception of God's 'foreknowledge' of His chosen messengers, or His elect. Such instances of this use of the word γινωσκειν as Gal 4^{8} (νῦν δὲ γνόντες θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ) and 1 Co 13^{12} (τότε δὲ ἐπιγνώσομαι καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσθην) are well known. The clause then means, according to Norden, that the Father foreknew—that is, in effect, selected or appointed—Jesus as His chosen messenger; and it contains no metaphysical or theological implications whatsoever concerning the ontological relations of the Father and the Son.

The whole stanza may, therefore, according to our author, be paraphrased as follows: 'The whole of my teaching was imparted to me by God. It was He alone—and no subordinate being—who foreknew and appointed me to be His messenger; and, consequently, it is I alone who possess the knowledge of Him, and can impart this knowledge to those whom I find worthy.'

[1] *The Sayings of Jesus* (Eng. tr. 1908), Excursus I.

(*To be continued.*)

The Bankruptcy of Human Wisdom.

By the Reverend Frederic C. Spurr, Hove.

Not infrequently has resentment been expressed by the intelligentsia at St. Paul's apparently contemptuous references to human wisdom, especially to that where he sharply asks 'where is the wise? Has not God stultified the wisdom of the world? . . . The world with all its wisdom failed to know God in his wisdom' (1 Co 1[20. 21], Moffatt). Why should this man, a Greek university man, himself no mean thinker, go out of his way to belittle human wisdom? Was there need for this ungenerosity? What is the mind for but to think? Besides, the Church has not accepted this estimate of Greek thought, as is evidenced by the first three centuries of acute thinking by Christian philosophers, to say nothing of St. Thomas Aquinas, who found in Aristotle a veritable gold mine.

Notwithstanding this rather peddling criticism, St. Paul's words have suddenly assumed a fresh meaning for our own time, since it is human wisdom that is now at the bar, once again, for judgment.

The Greeks, more than any other people, adored the human intellect. They were the philosophers, *par excellence*. Theirs was the utterly free mind, with liberty to examine every subject in heaven and earth. Nothing escaped them—the substance of the world, ethics, government, and even the gods. When St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians, the Greek mind had been dominant for five centuries. And it was showing signs of exhaustion. A profound scepticism reigned. Its speculations were disintegrating. It had seemingly mastered everything, save the one thing that mattered. It had failed to know God, and failed equally to know man. Man had filled its entire canvas, yet it was over man that Greek wisdom finally broke. On the one hand it bore the fatal mark of an artificial aristocracy. The poor slave did not enter into the scheme of things. He was disfranchised by heaven and earth. Any 'wisdom' bearing this mark must sooner or later break on the mass of humanity which is not aristocratic. A philosophy that cannot comprehend all men is by that much inhuman. On the other hand it was too shallow. The best of the Greek philosophers were well aware of human weaknesses. In humility they confessed their own. They cannot be accused of vain glory. Yet it is evident they never reached the depths of the human spirit. The best of them had no perception of what Christianity means by 'sin'—that mysterious force which poisons and weakens human life. Was not St. Paul's charge true—that the wisdom of the Greek missed both God and man? It was noble so far as it went. Many pages of Plato, and, much later, Marcus Aurelius, bring to the cheeks of many Christians in our time, a blush of shame. Yet, on the whole, the effort was a moral failure. It knew nothing of redemption. It could not speak to the common soul of man. . . .

What the Greek failed to do by his wisdom the gospel accomplished by its message, which became a dynamic gospel for the real salvation of man. It brought God to him, in the revelation of our Lord. What an abyss between Zeus and the *Père Céleste* of Jesus! It also brought man to God, and man to his fellow man. The ancient gibe that Christianity was mainly a religion for slaves was nothing more than snobbish scorn on the part of persons who regarded themselves as superior to the common herd. The fact is overlooked that in Christ the slave knew himself to be a man. If chains manacled his wrists, he had a free soul. He was redeemed, and the Master who redeemed him, although crucified, was 'alive for evermore.' His light affliction was but for a moment. There awaited him an 'eternal weight of glory.' But on earth he entered immediately a new brotherhood, from which all artificial distinctions were excluded. 'Neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free . . . but all one in Christ.' Christianity destroyed false aristocracies, and at the same time refused to idealize man. With the sense of liberation in Christ, there remained the sense of sin, which deepened with growing saintliness. The greatest apostle, in the closing days of his utterly consecrated

life, could write of himself as 'the chief of sinners.' Where the Greeks failed, the gospel succeeded. It was at once divine, fully human, and really profound.

The Church humanized life, and, as Mr. Christopher Dawson so well shows, offered to the world a new culture, and a better way of living. With the best intentions it took over many of the pagan practices, baptized them into the Holy Name, believing that they might become really Christian as they shed their ancient husks. Therein was the major error. The ancient paganism was not destroyed, it was merely veneered and received a Christian polish. And so in time there reappeared many of the pagan vices, in new forms, but essentially the same. The higher officials of the Church were not always free from them.

In her challenging book, *The Good Pagan's Failure*, Miss Rosalind Murray insists upon the point that the Christian spirit never really *penetrated* the soul of the old paganism. It did not transform it. Hence we have the sad story of what we call 'the Dark Ages.' Mr. Belloc seems to be under the impression that the 'Dark Ages' are an invention of malicious 'sectarian' Protestantism. But before Luther appeared, the Friars were declaiming against the vices of the people, reproving them for drunkenness, vendetta, and other sins which St. Paul long before had catalogued as 'heathen' vices. Miss Murray is abundantly justified in her condemnation of the pagan spirit, which, in its baser aspects disfigured the 'Dark Ages,' and broke out again and again in history in gross forms. In our own time we see its resurgence in the beastliness and brutality of the Marxian and Nazi régimes. In the name of *kultur* every kind of pagan barbarity has again raised its head. The better part of humanity universally condemns it.

When in 1453 the Turks captured Constantinople, they, without knowing it, prepared the way for a revival of classic 'paganism.' The Greeks, with their precious MSS., fled to Europe, and the revival of learning began. Europe heard again, for the first time in nearly a thousand years, the majestic periods of classical Latin and Greek. With the language, there came also the vision of that ancient world. The past was invested with a strange enchantment. The Church had forgotten the 'gospel of the kingdom,' and had overstressed the 'other world' beyond. Heaven and hell were of greater importance than the present world which, socially at least, was in a sad plight. To be a saint one must escape from the world and seek refuge in the cloister. The common world, while remaining nominally 'Christian,' was, in reality, a far from Christian world. Princes, barons, lords, and men of wealth had the monopoly of what education was available. The ordinary man was little better than a serf. There had been a great deal of rebellion before 1453. Groups of people were formed to obtain warmth of soul amidst the chill of nominal religiousness. Other groups were agitating for better conditions of life; the Renaissance brought new hope. That world before Christ appeared to them to be more human than the world they knew and lived in. Why not then return to it? There will always be debate as to the final moral results of the Renaissance upon the soul of man, but there can be none as to its intellectual results. The human mind suddenly achieved its freedom. Men could think freely without consulting the ecclesiastical mind. So wide scepticism prevailed. It was now MAN not God that filled the canvas. Art, literature, and interrupted science were reborn. And these things in themselves were good and necessary. . . . Activity of the mind was completed by practical activity. The modern world was born. Men reached out, expanded, explored, travelled—and *exploited*. Man was capable of everything. Humanism was entirely sufficient. A circle was drawn round this world, and within it man enclosed himself. Urged by the new humanism, many became inhuman. The marvellous exploits of that time must not blind us to the fact that the conquest of the world meant enslavement for the peoples who were conquered. Knowledge was not put to the service of coloured and distant peoples. It became, often enough, an instrument of greed. An image of Christ or one of the saints might be at the prow of a ship, in which hardened men sailed with murder in their souls. . . .

The Reformation of the sixteenth century attacked the world from another angle. If the Renaissance freed man's mind, the Reformation

freed his soul. He had liberty of access to God. Both movements proceeded side by side. Sometimes their principles overlapped. There were notable Christians who accepted the new learning and the new religious freedom. They saw nothing incongruous in this. They knew Christ and rejoiced in His liberty. Having found Him who is the Truth, the whole realm of lower truth was also theirs. Others refused the new learning, and stood aloof. To them God was all, and man nothing, with his wisdom. (That, of course, remains in part true of our own time.) But gradually the two were separated. For vast numbers life was loosened from all religious direction. Religion might be retained for certain emotional uses, but it had its limits, and on no account must it intrude upon other domains. 'Religion is religion, and business is business.' Commercial life was undertaken mainly for profits, and not for human service. Political life became infected with the idea of power. The main good of the πολις was obscured. Intellectual life played with abstractions. Men could think as they liked and speak as they liked. The idea of a supreme authority disappeared.

The pace quickened, the gulf widened, until, when the Enlightenment reached its zenith in the seventeenth century, Man openly wounded men. Colonial conquests were undertaken mainly for gain. A little earlier Hawkins could rejoice in the slave traffic. While prayers were recited in the cabin, negroes, forcibly dragged from their African homes, were dying in the hold. We have forgotten the horrible story of that period. The African world has not forgotten. The East India Company fought those who wished to educate the Indian native, 'they were only cattle, for the service of the white man.' That same company resisted William Carey's entry into India as a missionary; to evangelize these people would be to spoil them as hewers of wood and drawers of water. A member of Parliament could unblushingly tell the House that men like Carey were 'dangerous fanatics.' In Britain the intelligentsia were largely Rationalists and humanists, but they never lifted a finger to ease the burden of the poor, whom they left in utter ignorance and sunk in animalism. Down to the first third of the nineteenth century there was steady resistance on the part of the powers that be to the education of the people. And it took Shaftesbury forty years to obtain anything like justice for the workers in Britain. To that one man, said Lord Salisbury at the time of Shaftesbury's death, we owe most of the recent reforms in which working people rejoice.

Why the recital of this story? *Because it is the background of the conflict which has now burst upon the world.* We shall entirely miss the significance of what happened in 1914–1918 and what is happening to-day, and we shall be unable to visualize and to prepare for a different and better future, unless we keep in mind the facts we have so briefly, and so imperfectly sketched. It is cheaper and easier to select this or that man as a scapegoat, and gather upon his head our anger, than to trace the course of events which have culminated in Bolshevism, Nazi-ism, and Fascism. Evils have a way of gathering themselves into a dangerous point, as does impure blood into boils, tumours, and carbuncles. The evil man, who seduces and destroys an entire people, is the menacing focal point of evils which men, as a whole, have created. The destruction of the evil man is of little avail if the evils which produced him remain uncured. The crisis of 1914–18 was a sufficient warning to the world. But its *causes* were never attacked. Men still clung to their old 'wisdom,' and built their fabric upon it. Now that wisdom is in shreds. It has revealed itself as incredible folly.

It is only as we trace the long road carefully, that we can see the entire process. In the Middle Ages, one of the cruellest tortures was that of the crushing chamber. The victim was placed in a pleasant room where he might read and write. Excellent food was pushed through his door each day. Gradually he noticed that the chamber became smaller. The final torture came when, at length, its iron sides closed in upon him and crushed him to death. The horror of it all was, that he saw his fate, but was unable to escape it. Has not man in his wisdom built himself a chamber analogous to that? He was promised freedom on condition that he renounced the only religion which alone could liberate him. He could free

himself without reference to any Divinity or commanding Moral Law. He believed the story that he had come from the jungle. He would not believe that he was made in the likeness and image of God. And he has been squeezed back into the jungle. His wisdom of invention has turned him into a robot. His wisdom of diplomacy has ended in wars. His wisdom of Nationalisms has separated nation from nation. He was promised happiness, and as Thomas Masaryk has shown, in his *Modern Man and Religion*, suicide developed, until in some places it has become epidemic, and may be described, as he describes it, as 'suicidism.' The wisdom of man is aghast at its own performances. . . . But what of religion during this period? And in particular, what of Christianity? We have become so accustomed to the parrot cry, 'Christianity has failed,' or 'the Church has failed,' that repetition has made many believers nervous. It would be fatal to pretend that Christianity as presented to men in institutions and in many lives, represents the mind of Christ. But the more decent kind of sceptic has always distinguished between Christianity as truth, and Christianity as practised. Mr. Bernard Shaw can say that Christianity may save the world, but it must be really believed and truly lived. There is no need to pursue this line here. What concerns us in this study is the attempted disintegration of the living faith by various attempts at human wisdom divorced from that faith. There is, for example, the acid of respectability, so characteristic (in England at least) of the Victorian era. As a rebound from the fashion of the eighteenth century, which was frankly contemptuous of religion, there entered the new fashion of patronizing it. It was 'the thing—the correct thing,' to attend church (especially the State church). 'No gentleman abstained,' though many gentlemen were very rude during the sermon. The fashion passed when Edward VII. came to the throne. It then became 'the thing' to omit church, and take to the golf course instead. For the really devout, the Oxford Revival gave to the Church and the sacraments something of reality. Then the humanist reappeared to replace the vulgar kind of secularist who has disgusted people. Ethical societies sprang up. Religion was equated with geniality, social endeavours, kindness, tolerance. This world was all, the only religion consisted in making it a better place to live in. Life was one thing, religion quite another, an opinion to be held, or not held, at will. Many of these humanists were sincere, high-minded men, who however, forgot that their humanism had been conceived in an atmosphere which, despite man's fogs, Christ had created. And their humanism repeated the folly of the Greeks: it was too aristocratic, too restricted. It had no gospel of redemption for the common man. It accepted the social standards of its class. To it anything like a 'Salvation Army,' was 'Corybantic' (to use Huxley's jibe). At the heart of it, humanism was sterile. Lofty in thought, it was impotent in practice. On the very eve of August 1914 the most famous Rationalist-humanist of his day wrote confidently, 'Christianity has no future—its day is over. For salvation we must look to science and culture.' . . . Yet such humanists as Julian Huxley and C. E. M. Joad want 'religion without God.' They must have prayer. The *mystique* within them must be fed. And now, under our eyes, 'humanism' is in ruins. The breakdown of human wisdom, divorced from God, is complete. Red Mars is laughing at it. Sensitive human beings are disenchanted and alarmed.

What is wrong? It can be stated in a word—Masaryk's word: '*Man has lost his balance because he has lost his spiritual centre. He has lost the one religion which unifies life.*' The more that sentence is pondered, the more clearly its truth appears. When the nervous centre of our physical life is disturbed, we become unbalanced, irritable, see things out of perspective, and misinterpret events. When the psychic centre is deranged, we are open to all kinds of delusions and aberrations. In the cosmos, all order depends upon the parts remaining in obedient harmony with their centre. If it were possible for a planet voluntarily to detach itself from its sun, there could be only one fate awaiting it. The principle is rigorous everywhere. Man *qua* Man, and all men within the One Man, have their true centre in God. They have the power,

by reason of their freedom, to remain in harmony with that Centre, or to detach themselves from it, and become their own centre, revolving around themselves. As mere creatures they cannot escape God, in whom they live, move, and have their being, but as moral beings, they can omit God from their lives, and create their own laws which they deem to be wisdom. And if this is not what they have done, then what *is* the cause of the world's confusion? Either the will of God is the law of man's life, or he is left to will for himself as best he may. But he cannot find within humanity ONE Will, which constitutes his centre, and unifies his life. He is confronted with numerous wills which are engaged in perpetual strife, making a common brotherhood impossible, and inevitably leading to wars. Each nation does what is right in its own eyes. The humanist forgets all this, yet he blandly idealizes 'humanity,' in the abstract, and takes no account of his utter dependence upon God for every breath he draws, and no account of the sin, the pride, and the greed of the man, to whose real nature he is blind. He is in love with a phantom, while the reality is loading its guns. It is this suave independence of God, this pathetic belief in the all-sufficiency of man, this imprisonment of the soul in a small material planet, with its consequent *myope* and vanity, that is largely responsible for the present state of the world. Surely Masaryk is right in his contention, that man has lost his spiritual centre, and with it, the one power which alone unifies his life. Hence the disintegration which confronts us. The words of St. Paul remain true for our time; wisdom, divorced from its eternal source, has turned in upon itself, and stands revealed as folly.

It is to the Church primarily that the Apostle's message comes to-day. For the Church is the one body which lives by the principle of the Divine Wisdom which is also Love—as supreme for the life of man. At the heart of Christianity stands a Cross, the human expression in an inhuman form, of the self-sufficiency which thrusts aside the Kingdom of God as exacting and inconvenient, in favour of a kingdom of earthly power. And that earthly kingdom, of which they were so enamoured and so sure, crumbled in their hands when a more powerful kingdom crushed it out of existence. The event of A.D. 70 stands out in history as Judah's folly; and the Cross, erected to witness to the 'folly' of Christ, has become the eternal symbol of the Divine Wisdom as redemption. The Church has always conquered 'in this sign'—whenever it has surrendered to the wisdom of the world, it has taken the way to weakness and folly. Christianity lives by the supernatural. It fades and flags when it tries to live by anything lower.

Sine tuo numine
Nihil est in homine.

Is not our supreme need, in this mad hour, to return to our *Veni Creator*, and sing it with the soul, and with an uttermost surrender to God? The intellectual battle for the faith has been fought and won. The battle for the soul of man is now at its height. A Church living by the Divine Wisdom alone can win *that*. The wise of the world who thought to win it have lost the war. If they do not know it, the rest of mankind does.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Harbour.

By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Lisbon.

'Their desired haven.'—Ps 107[30].

A little fishing village. It might be anywhere on the east coast of Scotland, or the coasts of Cornwall or Devon. I know exactly where it is, but I am not going to tell. Perhaps somebody may recognize it from the description.

It is a gap in a bold and rocky coast, the only gap for miles. On either side of it, cliffs rise from the sea, impregnable, inhospitable, here and there thrusting out from their base reefs of cruel rocks that show at low tide like the teeth of some extinct

monster, and at high tide are marked by ugly swirls and occasional bursts of foam. Down the gap the road drops steeply and a stream laughs and leaps beside it to meet the sea in the harbour.

The harbour is a little haven with two stone piers which curve out like protecting arms, each holding up its light to guide the boats home at night. Round the harbour the cottages cluster, whitewashed, brown-thatched, creels at their doors, busy fingers baiting hooks and coiling lines. In the harbour the masts of the boats nod gravely and the little waves make a quiet music against the planking of their sides.

All sorts of people come to visit it; each sort sees something of its beauty and interest, and each has its own reason for coming there.

There are the holiday folk who come for an afternoon. They have heard that it is quaint and pretty and a good place for a picnic. So they pick their way down the path and sèttle down on the grass, open their picnic-baskets and make merry. They notice, more or less, between lunch and games, the beauty of the place. Some take a snapshot or two, and after a while they pack up and go, and if they are proper folk they leave no litter behind them. Perhaps they come again. Perhaps not. There are other places to see. One or two visits satisfy them that they know the place thoroughly; but they don't! They have only touched its rim.

There are other visitors who come again and again. There is a professor of geology. He is interested in its rocks and crags and in searching out the story of them—how the water carved out the little glen to the sea; how volcanic fires thrust up the crags and fused them into strange shapes; how they cooled into curious wavy lines—in fact, how it all came to be.

He has his own angle of view and finds the little place most interesting. Perhaps he will write a book about it and it will be worth reading. He, also, will think he knows all about the place; but he doesn't. He only knows its geology, and there is more than that.

Artists come, lots of them. They feast their eyes on its colours, its greens, browns and whites, the blues of sky and sea. They set up their easels and get busy. The sheer beauty of it appeals to them; and I think they get nearer to the heart of things than the others, for artists and poets see and feel much that is hidden from other folk. But even they haven't got home to the heart of the secret of the place.

The fisher-folk know it. The little harbour has a meaning for them that picnic parties and geologists and artists cannot know. These see it on sunny, quiet days. They have never seen it from the sea when storm is rising and the boats have to run for refuge; when the harbour lights shining across the darkening sea mean, not just something beautiful and picturesque, but *life*; when, beyond these lights and through that gap, lie home and all that makes life dear. They haven't watched with the women, with eyes straining out to sea, for the known sails; and sighed with them in thankfulness as one after another surges in between the protecting arms of the grey stone piers into quietness and safety and home. They haven't known what it is to say 'Thank God for the harbour!' And because they haven't known these things, they have never really seen the place at all.

Now this is not just the story of who noticed, and who studied, and who understood a little fishing village and its harbour; it's the story of the gospel of Jesus Christ, and the way different people look at Him.

There are those who picnic in the gospel. They visit it now and again. They come to church occasionally, on Christmas, or Good Friday, or Easter. They enjoy the hymns; they are touched by the story of the birth and death and resurrection of Christ. They get a real pleasure out of it all; but there are other things and other pleasures, and so a casual visit contents them. They only touch the hem of Christ's garment, but they are not seeking healing and they are not healed, and they go on their way not knowing Jesus.

There are those who study the Gospels, deep in the problems of how they came to be written—and quite right too, and very interesting. But there is more to be known about Jesus than that. He is more than a literary problem.

There are those who are attracted by the beauty of His life, His teaching, His parables. Theirs is an artistic interest. 'He is,' I read the other day, 'an artist in words.' True! but He is more than that.

It is good to be interested in Jesus Christ for any reason whatsoever; but the greatest reason, and the only reason which will turn interest into something deeper, is that He is a Saviour from sin and the things that slay the soul, a Saviour from the storms of temptation, a Refuge. To see Him across the sea of life, as the fishermen see the harbour, to feel with them that 'other refuge have I none'—this is to know Jesus. For 'Jesus' means 'Saviour,' and until you know Him as your Saviour you don't really know Jesus.

The Gipsy who told the Truth.

By the Reverend A. H. Sayers, Monmouth.

'Exceeding fair.'—Ac 7^{20}.

We are all interested in gipsies, and have always admired their brightly painted caravans, as they rumble along our country lanes. We were not frightened by their dark-skinned women, wearing brightly coloured handkerchiefs over their heads, and huge rings in their ears, when they called at our doors, wanting to sell clothes-pegs and to tell our fortunes.

We know a great deal about these strange, wandering folk, through that great Englishman, George Borrow, who went amongst them, learnt their language, their habits and customs, and has written some wonderful books as the result of his labours. He travelled in Spain, where he went to sell Bibles for the British and Foreign Bible Society, going through all sorts of queer and unexpected adventures.

Between the countries of France and Spain lies a range of mountains known as the Pyrenees. There are some people who live at one end of this range, who are known as the Basques. We have been sheltering some of the refugee Basque children in this country during and since the Spanish Civil War. Several hundreds returned to Spain only last month. Some of us had the pleasure of seeing Basque children dance and of hearing them sing.

We are told by those who have travelled in this part of Europe that the Basque people hold one very strange belief. It is that God allows all gipsies to steal five halfpennies a day. If they steal more than this, they themselves will have to answer for that amount and run the risk of being punished. This curious idea is explained by a legend which has to do with an incident that occurred in the early life of Jesus Christ.

We read in the New Testament that when King Herod had heard of the birth of Jesus, he was raised to fierce anger, and issued an order that all the children in Bethlehem who were two years of age and under were to be slain. As soon as Joseph and Mary heard of this brutal decree, they knew they must get out of the country as quickly as possible. They began at once to prepare for flight, and one night they stole out quietly from the Bethlehem Inn, where they had been staying, and where their babe was born.

The Basque legend relates that on their journey they had to pass through a town which had gates guarded by soldiers. They wondered what they could do to hide their infant, as they knew the guards would search them thoroughly. As they went along the road, there followed closely behind an old gipsy woman, who heard Mary and Joseph talking about their great trouble. As she came up to them she said: 'I am real sorry that you are so worried about getting through the gates with your baby. It's not an easy job, but if you are willing to hand it over to me, I can promise you that no soldier shall get hold of him.'

Mary was pleased and touched that an utter stranger should take so much interest in her babe, and even though she could not understand how the gipsy was going to save it from being killed, she thanked her very much as she accepted her wonderful offer.

The gipsy carried a big sack, which she decided was to be the hiding-place for the infant. Mary helped her as she gently placed him inside, and made him as comfortable as possible, so that he should not cry or make a noise. Then they went on their way with the gipsy carrying her sack over her shoulders and giving no sign of what was inside.

At last they all reached the town, and made ready to go through the gates. The soldiers were on guard, and allowed Mary and Joseph to pass through without any difficulty. But when the gipsy came up with her sack, they drew their swords and made her stop. 'What have you in that sack?' asked one of them. To their surprise, her wrinkled old face lit up with a smile as she replied: 'The most beautiful child in the world.'

They were just about to arrest her, when the officer laughingly said: 'You silly old woman! Do you think I can believe you've got a baby in your old sack? If you had, I swear you would keep your mouth shut. You can go.' The old gipsy, happier than ever, with no longer any fear of the soldiers, passed through the town carrying her sack which saved 'the most beautiful child in the world' from the sword of the cruel Herod.

The Christian Year.

Second Sunday after Epiphany.

The Three Generations.

By the Reverend R. J. Jones, B.A., B.D., Cardiff.

'And he did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, according to all that his father Amaziah did.'—2 Ch 26^4.

'And he (Jotham) did that which was right in the

sight of the Lord, according to all that his father Uzziah did: howbeit he entered not into the temple of the Lord. And the people did yet corruptly.'—2 Ch 27[2].

'And Ahaz gathered together the vessels of the house of God, and cut in pieces the vessels of the house of God, and shut up the doors of the house of the Lord.'—2 Ch 28[24].

The names of the kings of Israel and Judah have worried many young students of Old Testament history, and not a few of them have utterly failed to see any point in committing the monotonous lists to memory. There is a sameness in their names, and also in what the historian has to say about them. But he deals with each one in turn according to a strict formula. They either did, or did not, that which was right in the sight of the Lord. One cannot, however, fail to admire the faithfulness with which he applies his standard to each one as he appears before the bar of the historian, and his economy of words in relating the facts and pronouncing sentence. To recount the salient events of the long reign of Uzziah in twenty-three verses is no small achievement; and the apparently barren record becomes richly significant when we consider it carefully. The bare facts of this severe chronicler speak to us with a compelling eloquence once we learn to appreciate their expressive accents. Human history is much more than a row of unconnected dots in which each man starts from zero and finishes absolutely at the gates of death. The writer of the Book of Chronicles saw quite clearly that the old generation, for good or for ill, bequeaths a legacy to the new whether they like it or not. He does not discuss the vexed question of heredity and environment, but he does show that there is a very real relationship between one generation and another. It is true that he does not state it in so many words, but he presents the facts in such a way as to make it abundantly plain to the reader. Where both the unity of the historical process and the awful responsibility of successive generations are openly faced, life can be no other than real and earnest. A writer who is alive to all this is entitled to have his work included among the inspired writings, and to rank with the better known, because he too has something to teach men in every generation.

The message enshrined in the words we have quoted has a special significance, if we consider it in the light of the prevailing tendencies of our own day. He would indeed be an optimist who declared that the outlook for religion is bright. It seems to be assumed in many quarters that the educated classes will naturally drift away from the churches, and that Christianity in some mysterious way will manage to survive without them. Side by side with this we find that the idea of progress has very largely disappeared from men's minds, and that its place has been taken by an oppressive pessimism. Is it possible that the story of three generations of the royal house of Judah can provide a warning, and suggest a way of deliverance to us in the midst of the perils of the twentieth century? Let us see.

In Uzziah we have a man who was zealous for religion. The ordinances of Jehovah meant much to him, and he took them seriously. He endeavoured to keep the religion of his people free from the corrupting influence of the worship of the Baalim. It was not his fault that the nation was not completely weaned from heathen practices. It would seem that he gave heed to the warnings and counsels of the prophetic voices who strove to declare the character and purpose of Jehovah to the nation; and his religion made him strong and successful at home, and influential beyond the boundaries of his own country. The chronicler says that 'he did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, according to all his father Amaziah did.' Like his father, he considered religion to be a matter of vital importance both for himself and for his people. Without it there can be no creative morality. In fact, religion living and virile is the parent of righteousness. In making the sanctuary the centre of the national life Uzziah did much more for the welfare of his subjects than he could have done by mere exhortation. If our fathers in the nineteenth century did not always stress the obligations of man to man, their religious devotion led to many reforms which we take for granted to-day. It is easy to maintain that they overdid it, and that their success often made them proud and self-righteous. This, at any rate, happened in the case of Uzziah. 'When he was strong, his heart was lifted up to his destruction.' In this mood, he came into conflict with the temple authorities, and was struck by the terrible disease which isolated him from his fellows for the remainder of his days. All the same, we should not deny to him the credit for having given religion a place of honour, and for having been a real benefactor of his people. There seems, however, to be a very real connexion between his life and conduct and what we see later in his son Jotham.

Uzziah was the man who went to church, and tried to lead a decent life. We find in him religion and morality. Jotham, on the other hand, seems to have been equally moral without being religious. 'He did that which was right in the sight of the

Lord, according to all that his father Uzziah did; howbeit he entered not into the temple of the Lord.' We are not told why he did not go to the temple. Some of those who follow his example in our country to-day would say that he had had too much religion during his early days. To judge from the attitude of many who were brought up in religious homes to the appeal of public worship, compulsory church attendance often breeds rebels who throw religion overboard when they gain their liberty. This is surely not a conclusive argument against religion, but in support of the contention that a fine technique is required to present religion to the young. The controversy between Uzziah and the priests suggests another explanation of the son's neglect of the temple. If Jotham had a real regard for his father, it is not improbable that he attributed to the temple officials the affliction which overtook his father. Explain it as we will, he retained his father's morality whilst discarding his religion. The father had religion and morality; the son had only morality. He could assert quite truthfully that he was as good a man as his father. Many do the same thing to-day; nor is there any need to dispute their assessment. What is often forgotten, however, is that there is nothing creative for the future in the moral life divorced from religion and its power. Jotham quite clearly was living upon the moral capital of his father. This is a fact which thousands of men and women ignore nowadays, and which the Book of Chronicles brings home to us in all its disastrous consequences by relating the events of the next generation in Ahaz.

The second step, as we see it in Jotham, was not so bad, but the third as it appears in Ahaz is full-blooded apostasy. He 'cut in pieces the vessels of the house of God, and shut up the doors of the house of the Lord, and he made him altars in every corner of Jerusalem.' It is small wonder that 'he did not that which was right in the sight of the Lord,' for he had no religious endowment. Without his grandfather's religion, he was unable to retain his father's morality. Surely he is more to be pitied than blamed. The same law operates in the world of Nature. When a tree is cut down, it will sprout for one year, but no more. If religion is lost in the second generation, morality disappears in the third. If we are to avoid a similar disaster, there must be a genuine return to the vital religion of Jesus Christ. In this the mothers have a responsible part to play; and the historian hints that this is so when he names the mother of Uzziah, and the mother of Jotham, though not the mother of Ahaz. How much do we owe to Mary? Who can tell?

SEPTUAGESIMA.

At a Baptism in War-time.

BY THE REVEREND R. W. STEWART, B.D., B.Sc., KILLERMONT.

'He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.'—1 Co 1[31].

At a baptismal service a congregation is reminded again of the many homes which have been gladdened by the birth of children in them. Joy in life depends very much on the presence of hope; and human hopefulness is very largely bound up with the existence of children in the community.

While that remains true, one of the first thoughts of any parent to-day must be: What a world for a little child to enter. One of the most tragic remarks I ever heard was made to me the other day by a bright, busy, healthy, independent young woman in her early twenties, who had just watched some soldiers proceeding to join their units. 'One thing I am thankful for,' she said passionately, 'is that I have no home of my own or prospect of one, no young man, no children in whom I have a special interest.'

What a world for young folk! Here is a tale of to-day. A lady in Glasgow has a charwoman, a thoughtful woman and a devoted mother of an only child. Every extra half-crown she can earn is saved for the higher education of her daughter. This little girl is a sensitive child. One day she came home from school horrified and frightened, because she had heard for the first time, or rather taken in for the first time, the story of the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. That is the family situation—a gentle intelligent child and a wise sympathetic mother. Well, the other day they sat in a picture-house together, when on the screen appeared a little procession of German prisoners. 'Poor laddies,' said the woman. 'Hush!' replied the little daughter angrily 'If people hear you they will think you are a pro-German.' 'You know I am not,' said the mother, 'but we should be sorry for them all the same.' 'You wouldn't say that,' was the child's reply, 'if they dropped a bomb on you.' And as she told the incident, it was evident that this mother was distressed and perplexed to see that the world seemed to be crushing out the gentleness and sympathy in her little girl's nature.

If this can happen here how dreadful is the danger to youth in Germany, where brutality and hardness are taught to children as virtues of a virile race.

What a world to bring children into! Would not most people be willing to state as their most definite war aim a desperate hope and determination that it shall be made a different world for them to grow up in.

Now the sacrament of baptism is a reminder, both in connexion with the infants for whom it is waiting, and for all who long ago were themselves baptized, that they are born not only into the world, but into the Church of Christ. They come not only into the confused, struggling, fear-smitten state of affairs which is called civilization, but also into the fearless, peaceable, believing fellowship of the saints. While every child has the risks and hardships of life to face, some are born with an unusual advantage. It may be no more than a specially good physique and sound constitution. Or it may be a measure of financial security, a home filled with comforts, a family connexion that will launch them well. At what value should one rate the spiritual advantage to which this sacramental sign of baptism is given, to be born into membership of the Christian community. From the beginning the Church has felt itself to be a fellowship in which there was a new quality of life, freedom, joy, enthusiasm, unity, love. Members of the Church who have themselves any experience of the blessedness of belonging to this fellowship need have no hesitation in the gladness with which they welcome another and another to share in the inheritance of faith.

This is plain, unchallengeable truth. The difficult, practical task for the Christian community is to make it an operative reality in time of war. That little incident from everyday life illustrates the problem in all its acuteness as it presented itself to one mother. How can one keep alive and active at the same time these two motives? On the one hand there is a sound desire for victory based not on mere patriotic sentiment, but on the profound conviction that the very principles of Christian civilization have to be defended against the onslaught of a pagan Government that has no regard for reason or justice or human dignity and personality. On the other hand there is the sense of brotherhood with all mankind, even those who stand for things that are hateful, and the warm feeling of pity for the suffering even of enemies.

People do combine these sentiments. An account was given over the air the other day by an east-countryman of the bringing down of a hostile aeroplane in the Lothians. With genuine satisfaction he told of the British fighter's success; and then he went on to describe the finding of one wounded German airman and how they carried him down the field on a farm-gate for a stretcher and put him in an ambulance, and gave him a cigarette. There is an old story to the same point in British naval history. When the Dutch admiral struck his flag after a long fight at Camperdown, the men on Admiral Duncan's ship began to cheer. 'Don't cheer boys,' called the Admiral, 'they are dying over there.'

But this is all difficult and confusing for children, and for others too. Christian people must have it in mind that in a very special way the Church is the custodian of feelings of humanity and charity towards the foe. 'Father forgive them,' prayed Jesus, as He was nailed to the Cross. Christian fathers and mothers have this responsibility to their children, to protect them from and warn them against the savage mood that so easily prevails in war. When the time comes for making peace too, it will be for Christian sentiment to ensure that it is a peace that will make for reconciliation and good will. The Archbishop of York has put forward as a Christian suggestion one that deserves consideration, that victors should not themselves dictate terms of peace but should summon a conference of nations outside the conflict to devise a settlement that would be right.

Another line along which the Church has a responsibility to its members and specially to its children is to make clear that the fellowship of the Church is a larger and deeper reality than any bond of race or nationality. In time of war patriotic feeling runs high and the tendency is to let patriotism mean everything. And it is not everything, not even the noblest or largest thing. 'Patriotism is not enough,' said the patriot-martyr, Nurse Cavell. While there is something wonderful, moving, inspiring in the unity of the British Empire, in the fact that men of so many various races and traditions, connected by so loose and vague a legal tie, feel bound together in a strong common allegiance to the same conceptions of justice and freedom and democratic government, there is something not only holier but still more wonderful and inspiring in such a conference as that held at Tambaram, where men and women of every race and colour and allegiance gathered together as a council of the one Church of the Lord Jesus Christ on earth. To belong to this fellowship is to be a member of an eternal kingdom founded on the Rock of Ages, possessing a law of love that cannot be changed, following a pattern of life that is laid down once for all in the perfect example of Jesus Christ:

> Saviour, if of Zion's city
> I, through grace, a member am,
> Let the world deride or pity,
> I will glory in Thy name.

In a world where men are proud of being British, of being Nazis, of being Communists, is the Church proud, does it make its children proud of being Christian?

Perhaps 'proud' is not the word. Should it rather be 'grateful.' But it is a great matter to be a Christian. However small may be one's own accomplishment, however imperfect the particular Church to which one may belong, every one who feels himself the object of the love of Christ, who laid down His life for His friends, who loves and trusts Him, and who therefore loves all other men who feel about Christ like himself, is drawn into a fellowship in which he must rejoice with all the strength of his being. 'Glory' is the New Testament word. 'I will glory in His name.' Is this the dominant mood of Church members? Do they bring up their children in this supreme fervent loyalty to the kingdom of God?

SEXAGESIMA.

The Eternal Voice.

'There came therefore a voice out of heaven. . . . The multitude . . . said that it had thundered: others said, An angel hath spoken to him.'—Jn $12^{28f.}$ (R.V.).

But Jesus had heard a *message*. And Jesus said, 'Father.'

Perhaps we must make allowance for the Eastern way of putting things and suppose that a sudden, inward certainty dawned on the soul of Jesus at His baptism, and, at the transfiguration, on the disciples also, and that Jesus described this type of experience to His men as a 'voice from heaven.' In the incident before us it is not irreverent to wonder whether a sudden peal of thunder seemed to the superstitious crowd a very voice from heaven, and the lightning playing around Him the bright apparel of an angel. We do not, and cannot know.

We hear the authentic ring of literal truth when Jesus says, 'Father, glorify thy name.' No fanciful interpretations are needed now. When the multitude says, 'It thundered,' or, 'An angel spoke to him,' Jesus the Son says, 'Father.'

It is an hour full of conflicting ideas for Jesus. How close it brings the Master to us to realize that sometimes the clouds were down, and the fog thick, even in His radiant soul! 'Now is my soul troubled,' He cries, 'and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour? But for this cause came I to this hour. Father, glorify thy name.' Then immediately comes the lightning flash of inward certainty.

Surely, the message for us is just this, that if we keep close to God in humble prayer and communion, with as much faith as we can muster; if, in a word, we are *sons*, we shall hear, amid all the confused tumult of the world, a message from our *Father*, making at least the next step plain for us. And while the world watches events rush past, and can descry no meaning in them, the *son*, the one who is close to the bosom of the Father, hears a secret voice, detects a thread of purpose running through both the things that God wills, like sunshine and bird-song and health and love; and the things that God allows, like sorrow and war and pain and poverty and frustration and evil.

As we stand on the platform of a busy railway station we are amazed at the number and complexity of the system of signalling by coloured lights. It seems wonderful that an engine-driver could ever take a train through that intricate maze. Then an express thunders through. The lights so confusing to us—or merely pretty—were to him signals that flashed a *message*.

Let us take the parable further: The signalman didn't *make* the lights. He used lights that others had made in order to flash his message to the driver.

Our Father is endlessly speaking, trying to get through to us, asking us to listen in. Not only in stars and flowers and sunsets and bird-song does He speak to us. The Signalman flashes messages to us in lamps He neither made nor lit. In what seems meaningless depression, useless loneliness and sorrow, wasted pain, widespread calamity, if we are patient and quiet and trustful, though we may not be able to make much of the message yet, we shall hear at least a word or two.

1. Consider life's outward setting. Look at the world. It is thrown off from the sun. Twenty-five million years afterwards, a race of men begins to crawl about on its surface, and twenty thousand years after that they have it all 'explained.' The geologist talks of its rocks, the biologist of its life processes, the botanist of its plants, the zoologist of its animals, the ornithologist of its birds, the piscatologist of its fishes, the entomologist of its insects. The explorer and geographer can make a map of it. The astronomer can tell you its weight. Our evening paper can tell the weather for a penny. . . ! *But what does it all mean?* What a thunderstorm of facts! What lightning calculations! What a deluge of figures! But what do they all *signify*? Is it all a meaningless maze of materialistic facts, or is it one syllable in God's explanation of Himself to men, so that the 'meanest flower that blows' and the merest hint of design,

show the working of the mind and power of One whom a son may call *Father?*

Surely W. H. Carruth is making the same point in his lovely verses:

A fire-mist and a planet,
A crystal and a cell,
A jellyfish and a saurian,
And caves where the cave-men dwell;
Then a sense of law and beauty,
And a face turned from the clod:
Some call it Evolution
And others call it God.

2. Consider the story of man's life which we call history. World events which shape the lives and destinies of millions do not too obviously bear the mark of divine plans.

Yet when we have realised the fact of man's free will, and that man must be capable of great evil or he could never rise to great moral heights, do we not see in all history, past and contemporary, *His* story? Pilate may seem to hold all power and his Prisoner be destroyed. Yet Pilate passes, and, shortly afterwards, all the pomp of imperial Rome passes for centuries into the shadows. Paul was in prison for over two years, but his influence for moral good was greater than that of all the Roman emperors put together.

We see more and more that methods that are not His methods fail to help men towards their true goal. So often the true pioneers have been those who seemed to fail, those who suffered much and those who died. The eternal voice whispers through every era of our history, through every world crisis. And where some may see a mere useless welter of blood and tears, the sound of war and confusion, the thunder of man's tumult, those who are sons know that God is calling. They hear the voice of their Father. They hear Him pleading with humanity to walk in His ways, but also they know *that He will use even those happenings which seem to carry out the plans of the evil one to fulfil His own purposes.* And all His little ones will play their part, even if the thunder so deafened them that they died thinking that God was dead. God was in them, working His purposes out.

A picket frozen on duty,
A mother starved for her brood,
Socrates drinking the hemlock
And Jesus on the rood;
And millions who, humble and nameless,
The straight, hard pathway trod:
Some call it Consecration,
And others call it God.

3. Consider man's inner experiences.

My faith burns low, my hope burns low,
Only my heart's desire cries out in me;
By the deep thunder of its want and woe
Cries out to Thee.

Don't let us lose touch with Him, even when it *feels* as though there were no one there. Our trouble may be part of the world's burden of sin or ignorance or folly. Unemployment is. Poverty is. So is a great deal of illness. The trouble may be weariness of body. A worried brain and tired and harassed nerves can make the whole universe seem out of joint. But God will use lamps He did not either make or light to flash a signal to us.

The multitude may pass on its way saying, 'It thunders.' The multitude may become bitter, cynical, despairing and may laugh us to scorn for our pathetic listening. The multitude may declare that there is no meaning or message or significance in life at all.

But we know better than that! God is speaking in every experience. The world is not our prison, but His school. Life is not a meaningless monotony, but a sacrament. History is not a mere sequence, but a plan. God is not a torturing devil, but a loving Father. Religion is not a cult, but a communion. Man is not an anthropoid ape, but a divinity. The eternal voice is not meaningless sentimentality, but the unresting quest of God's Holy Spirit to reveal His nature, His purpose and grace and draw us to Himself.

The multitude said, 'It thundered. . . .' But Jesus said: 'Father!' So very much depends on *whether we see what God means.* 'Lord, that we may receive our sight!'

Give me a heart to find out Thee,
And read Thee everywhere.[1]

QUINQUAGESIMA.

Love in Action.

'By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.'—Jn 13^{35}.

Like other hard-worked words, 'love' has to carry all too many meanings; it can signify almost anything from degraded passion to ecclesiastical politeness, from high romance to cheque-book charity. But love, in the highest sense, in the Christian sense, is the most wonderful thing in the world.

It is quite clear that *Jesus Himself made love the*

[1] L. D. Weatherhead, *The Eternal Voice*, 15.

supreme test of discipleship. 'By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.' In one of His most vivid parables He insisted that at the final judgment men will be tested not by their orthodoxy of belief, but by whether or no they have set selfishness aside and have taken the trouble to care for those who needed their help. Let us look freshly at this challenge to men to live by the law of love, and ask whether, in a world apparently ruled by fear and selfishness and by hatred and violence, to talk of love is not mere religious emotionalism, unpracticable idealism.

Now to begin with, it is indisputable that *Jesus did actually show the world a new way of living.* He had to die to make men understand it; and they did understand it. He told them, and they grasped it, that if in sober fact 'God so loved the world that he gave'—that if God is like that, well then men must also treat one another in similar fashion: they cannot do otherwise. What such a way of living involved, Jesus showed them again and again; in the inner group of His disciples—to take just one instance of His magic influence—He made Simon the Zealot, the ardent nationalist, and Matthew the publican, the hated tax-gatherer, sit down at the same table as brothers and friends. In all the rubs of daily life, in a world of divisions and hostilities and hatreds, *He showed the way of triumphant friendliness,* and they learnt it.

Professor Harnack, the great German teacher, in a pregnant phrase, once described Christianity as 'infinite love in ordinary intercourse.' That phrase describes the secret of the astonishing Christian progress and Christian triumph in the first century. From the Christian experience of God there did begin to emerge a kind of Christian commonwealth which, as an acute thinker has pointed out, was 'not a machinery for saving souls but the redemption of a corporate life.' Those first Christians made tremendous claims and tremendous assertions; but claims and assertions were justified by the facts. 'We know'—so they asserted—'that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brotherhood.' 'We know what love is by this, that He—Jesus—laid down His life for us; so we ought to lay down our lives for the brotherhood.' This ringing confidence about the way of brotherhood belongs to the very core of the Christian message; and, if Jesus is right about God and life and love, it is in harmony with the very stuff of the Universe: it goes with and not against the grain of ultimate Reality.

It cannot be said too often or too emphatically that *this is the way out, and the only way out, from our present world chaos.* There are no natural, immutable laws of economics, of war, of race antipathy, from which man can never escape. Political and economic systems are caused by the action and interaction of persons, of human beings. Change the persons and we change the systems. Where men come to treat one another as fellow members of one brotherhood, there we will get a revolution in political, industrial, and social life.

Church membership should properly be regarded as committing us to working for a Christian structure of society, the Church itself being—ideally—a working model of what human society will one day become. Of course this means drastic change. Authentic Christianity is always revolutionary in quality. Would that we Christians so lived our Christianity that we could everywhere make men see that Fascism and Communism are *not* the only alternatives to the present system. There is a third alternative—the Christian one.

To work for this Christian order means *hard thinking* as well as courageous action. The law of love must not be interpreted as sloppy benevolence, or as ineffectiveness in the face of evil. We can hardly imagine a reign of law and justice that does not involve some kind of coercion at some point. But we can imagine, and we must work for, a state of affairs within the nation and between the nations, where the main lines of man's common life shall be determined not by violence but by agreement, not by tyranny but by liberty, not by group selfishness but by the universally recognized rights of personality.

In the year 1688 that great Christian, the author of the immortal *Pilgrim's Progress,* John Bunyan, was preaching his farewell sermon in a room in Whitechapel. Frail and ill as he was, his love for God and for men burned in his veins like fire to the end. 'Dost thou see a soul,' he pleaded, 'that has the image of God in him? Love him. Love him. Say to thyself, *This man and I must go to heaven together some day.* Serve one another. Do good to one another, and if any wrong you, pray God to right you, and love the brotherhood.' To 'love' in this kind of sense is *an art*; and *to be an artist in loving* is a great adventure. It is an altogether higher kind of religion than 'the religion of being kind to granny and the cat.'

Sometimes this art of loving needs to be learnt, and applied, in the most ordinary and familiar places. What about family relationships—man and wife, parent and child—which have somehow gone wrong, and need a resolute and understanding kind of love to set them right?

Or, again, this practice of the art of loving may well take us farther afield. One of the best ways to promote international friendship on the big scale is to do it on the small scale, by actually getting to know and to make friends with men and women of other nations and races. Last summer, in a parish near Lichfield, the Vicar and his people wanted to do something practical with their Christianity, so they had twenty-five French and German visitors to stay for a fortnight in their homes—just ordinary homes. Naturally, it was all carefully planned and organized, and the scheme proved a wonderful success; it was a striking demonstration of international friendship. Those people discovered, what Christ Himself has told us, that *there are not any foreigners; only neighbours and potential friends.*

Most men and women are born to be friendly. That wonderful hymn of love of St. Paul finds a responsive echo in our hearts. But we find it hard to begin, and perhaps equally hard to continue. The honest truth is we can't do this thing without God. It is God's spirit and nothing else that can create in a man's heart and mind that triumphant friendliness so that it becomes his normal, instinctive attitude towards all the world. Jesus never proposed His Kingdom of love, His universal brotherhood, on any other terms. Whenever and wherever we find that Jesus Christ is *real*, that His spirit makes contact with *ours, then we simply can't help caring about other people—'loving' them in fact.* 'We love,' cried St. John, 'because he first loved us.'[1]

[1] E. S. Woods, *Love in Action*, 90.

The Christian Year.

By the Reverend Alfred E. Garvie, D.D., London.

The Editors of The Expository Times give a good lead to Christian ministers in their recognition of *The Christian Year*, and I am glad to follow that lead in here offering a plea for its wider observance, and some indication of how it can be used most fully.

I.

Here is the plea. (1) I am quite convinced from long experience and wide observation that the best use is not being made of the pulpit for the necessary instruction in Christian truth and edification in Christian grace of the congregations where the common practice is followed of what I cannot but call a *casual* selection of texts and subjects, affording it may be variety, but sacrificing continuity and adequacy in teaching. There are occasions when a text or a subject takes a preacher captive, and he cannot do otherwise than preach upon it; but he should not make a custom of waiting for such a seizure, for he will waste much precious time in so waiting. That the preacher should always be seeking the guidance of the Spirit does not need to be said; but it is a false assumption that that guidance is spasmodic, not systematic, and comes as a sudden impulse and not as a constant direction in his study and reflection. The ignorance of many of the laity of the Bible and the Gospel is often deplored. For that ignorance the pulpit must share the blame, if its evangelism is not educational.

(2) It is a loss in goodness and godliness if the preacher isolates himself, and through the manner and the content of his preaching his hearers from the community of believers, 'the communion of saints' in heaven and earth, in all lands and all ages. As he directs them to look unto 'Jesus, the author and finisher of faith,' he should enable them also to realize that in their worship they are 'compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses' (He $12^{1.2}$), that in the local congregation the universal Church, the body of Christ, is with Christ present, that the pulpit is witnessing to the faith once for all delivered unto the saints (Jude 3), and that the love of God, revealed in our Lord Jesus Christ is theirs in the 'common possession of the Holy Spirit' (2 Co 13^{14}). The unity and the continuity of the Church should be made manifest in the preaching, and not the individualism of the preacher and the localism of the hearers.

(3) Protestantism asserts the priesthood of all believers, their immediate access to God through Jesus Christ. This does not mean, however, that

the relation to God in which it is their privilege to have this immediate access, has not been mediated by the Church. The object of Christian faith is the divine revelation in Christ, and that has come to the world not in individual mystical experiences, but in the course of history. God has revealed Himself, not in words only but in acts of sacrificial love and saving grace, of which the Scriptures contain the record, and so convey the certainty. When on the one hand the content of the Christian religion is reduced to the measure of the teaching and example of the man Jesus, as a negative criticism of the Gospels leaves Him, or on the other is resolved into a theosophy—a speculation about a mythical Christ, and both these aberrations are claiming a place in the Christian Church, it is imperative for the preacher to recognize for himself and to impress on others, the *facts* of the Christian revelation, the Incarnation, the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, the Descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, the continued presence and activity of the Risen Lord, the sole Mediator between God and man, in His Spirit in the Church, and their permanent and universal significance and value, as the manifestation and the operation of the eternal reality in temporal events. If these facts are what the Christian Church believes and witnesses them to be, no other events in man's long tale on earth can compare with them in interest and importance. As the preacher realizes their magnitude, what larger or loftier themes can he desire to inspire him, and so make his preaching Pentecostal in its fervour and its power? He may well ask himself, 'Who is sufficient for these things?' These things which so overawe him may cheer him with the assurance, 'our sufficiency is from God' (2 Co 3^5). If a personal testimony may be forgiven, I never feel more freedom and joy in preaching than when these facts are my theme, and I am trying to share with others how much they mean to me. Our preaching on these subjects cannot be confined to any season; but the dates of the Christian Year, when the minds of many are more receptive and responsive, offer an appropriate opportunity, and impose an imperative obligation.

(4) I add a supplementary consideration, which I know may not have the same weight with others as it has with myself. One of the great services which Irenæus rendered to Christian theology was his insistence, in opposition to Gnosticism, on the identity of the Creator and the Redeemer God; and I am convinced that it is a loss, not to theology only, but to piety also, to dissever the God of Grace from the God of Nature. We have in the Psalter Nature as well as history and devotion psalms. Jesus was a close observer of the ways of Nature as well as the works of man, as His parables show. He read His Heavenly Father's care and bounty in the processes of Nature. While calling His disciples to seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness He relieved what He recognized as legitimate a concern for the natural goods on which human life depends, 'All these things shall be added unto you' (Mt 6^{24-34}). Paul declares that God 'left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave you from heaven rains and fruitful seasons, filling your hearts with food and gladness' (Ac 14^{17}). It is in July, August, and September that even town dwellers, whose daily calling is far from the soil, renew their contact with Nature in their holidays, and the record of harvests reminds us that all human industry is ultimately dependent on the creative activity of God in Nature. To appreciate the beauty Nature displays, and the bounty it affords, and to be grateful to God for both should be recognized as a fitting worship of God. Accordingly I should include in the Christian Year the Flower Service and the Harvest Thanksgiving. In both, the worshippers can express that gratitude to God in generosity to their fellow-men, and so render their worship an acceptable service.

(5) While it is doubtful whether Jesus was born on the date Christian custom assigns, and the festival has pagan associations, Easter and Whitsuntide are certain as the dates of the events they commemorate, and both continue Jewish festivals, Passover and Pentecost, which had reference to natural seasons before they were related to historical events. There is an appropriateness, which should not be ignored in this reference. In spring life revives from winter's death: our Lord and Saviour rose from the dead. In summer life is displayed in its fulness, the Spirit of God brought to the

Church fulness of new life in God. In the widespread pagan myths of the god who dies in winter and rises again in spring, we have not only an anthropomorphic explanation of natural processes, now discarded, but a truth, a disclosure of God. Easter follows Good Friday; man's salvation came through God's sacrifice. As in Nature, so in human goodness and divine grace 'there is dying to live,' losing life to find it. Nature seems to offer no analogy for Christmas; and yet, if we look closer, can we not discover one? When the shortest day is past, and the sun's shining is lengthened, may we not recognize that Nature has made a fresh start, and winter already holds the promise of spring? God 'sent forth his son in the fulness of the time' (Gal 4^4); and we can discern a preparation for the gospel in Jewish religion, Greek culture, Roman law; yet, till He came, while there were voices crying to God in the night, 'the light *shineth* in the darkness, and the darkness apprehended it' (Jn 1^5 R.V.), or, 'overcame it (R.V. margin) not.'

II.

Having offered this plea for the observance of the Christian Year let me now offer some indications of how the fullest use may be made of it. I should not confine it to the three festivals usually observed. The seasons of *Advent* and *Lent* suggest a more extended use, and each of these seasons might be expanded. (1) From the beginning of October till Christmas the preacher might fully deal with the preparation for the coming of Christ, not only in the Hebrew religion, as recorded in the Old Testament, but also in the religions of the world, especially those in which the primitive natural religion was found inadequate, and was superseded or supplemented by a founded religion, in which a man, conscious of his own and others' needs, believed himself to have made a discovery of something better, an advance in thought and life, and was constrained to share it with others. In my judgment religion is not merely human aspiration and effort, in which, apart from the revelation, which is the object of our faith, there is no divine initiative. Men are seeking God, because God is drawing them unto Himself. Wherever and whenever there is any sincere religion, there is some revelation, imperfect, not in God's imparting, but in man's apprehending. Especially in the founders of the the religions there must be discerned a movement of God's Spirit in man. Every one of these religions has proved its insufficiency; for the sufficiency is in Christ alone; and yet in them God was preparing men for the Advent of the Word Incarnate. Jesus claimed to fulfil love and prophecy (Mt 5^{17}); and modern scholarship enables us to trace the progressive revelation of which He was the consummation. There is a tendency to-day to depreciate the Old Testament, and for the wholeness and fulness of our faith in the revelation, of which Christ is the focus, it is imperative that that tendency be combated, and the Old Testament be given the place which in God's purpose properly belongs to it. I do not suggest a course of lectures on the religions of the world, or on the teaching of the Prophets, academic in character; but a series of sermons, popular in treatment, might be given on the problems the founders of religions sought to solve, and their solution in the Gospel, for example: Buddha—the cause and the cure of suffering; Confucius—the conditions of social order; Zoroaster—the conflict of good and evil, etc.; and on the truths in which the prophet anticipated the teaching of Christ, for example: Amos—the impartiality of God's judgment (3^2); Hosea—the tender love of God (2^{16}); Isaiah—the holiness of God (6); Micah—God's demands (6^8); Jeremiah—the new covenant (31^{31-34}); Deutero-Isaiah—vicarious suffering (52^{13}–53^{12}). The study necessary for such preaching would be amply rewarded.

(2) Not in Lent only, but through the whole period between Christmas and Easter, the life of Jesus might fruitfully claim attention; such crucial events as the Baptism, the Temptation, the Call of the Disciples, the Teaching of the Kingdom of God, the Confession at Cæsarea Philippi, the Transfiguration, the Predictions of the Passion, the Entry into Jerusalem, the Last Supper, Gethsemane, Calvary, the Resurrection, should have their significance for Christian faith expounded clearly and fully. Usually there is one verse (or a few verses) in which that significance can be focused, which may serve as text. On the external conditions only the imperative minimum should be

spent ; it is on what Jesus experienced and achieved that all the stress should fall. It is as the Incarnate Word, Son of Man and Son of God, Saviour and Lord, that the preacher should seek to apprehend His historical reality for himself so vividly and intensely that his words will convey that reality to others. It is not the man Jesus only that the Gospels present, but God as man, the revelation of the eternal God Himself in time ; and it is in His full reality that there is the gospel for men. Fully appreciating the truth and the grace of the earthly ministry as the revelation of God in word and deed, the preacher will do well to put himself in the Apostolic Succession and throw into bold relief the Cross and the Resurrection, the vicarious sacrifice and the victory over sin and death. Here are focused the passion and the action of God in Christ to redeem mankind from sin, and to reconcile men unto God.

(3) The period after Easter and Whitsuntide might be devoted to a consideration of the presence and activity of the Risen Lord through His Spirit in the Church, His Body. If the Incarnation is the consummation of the Revelation of God in the Old Testament, the Church as the body of Christ, the organ of the Spirit of God, is the continuation of the Incarnation. The objective Sacrifice and Salvation of God in Christ, 'the finished work' 'once for all,' is here continued and diffused in subjective experience, as men are being saved and used in saving. The doctrine of the Spirit and what is an inseparable complement, that of the Church, do not in many churches receive the attention in preaching that both deserve. The faith that receives and responds to grace is a human activity, but also a divine in man. It is by the Spirit's enlightenment and quickening that Christ is apprehended and accepted as Saviour and Lord. The Christian life in so far as it is Christian is an *inspired* life. The Holy Spirit is the 'common possession' of all believers, by which they form the community, which we call the Church. The Church is a human society in its temporal and spatial aspects, but it is also a manifestation and activity in time and space of the eternal reality of God, who is in the grace of Christ through the Spirit, the common possession of believers, making and using it in His saving sovereignty. Accordingly attention should not be limited in preaching to what is recorded in the Holy Scriptures, even if the texts, according to hallowed custom, be always chosen therefrom. The Church is a present and active reality, and the Spirit is still present and active in the Church. How much would preaching be enriched if the history of the Spirit in the Church were more drawn up, if not for separate treatment, yet by frequent use for illustration ! So abundant is the material in the Fourth Gospel, and the Epistles of Paul for the treatment of these themes—the Spirit and the Church—that I need not offer a selection of texts or subjects.

(4) There are few churches, I suppose, that in any way mark *Trinity Sunday*, and yet the Christian revelation, which it is the preacher's function and privilege to expound and apply is that of the triune God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit ; and I am quite sure that it is an incalculable loss that many preachers do not themselves apprehend and declare that revelation in its wholeness and fulness. It is focused in the Apostolic Benediction in 2 Co 13^{14}. The eternal reality of the love of God is revealed in temporal history in the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and is received in individual and corporate experience in the 'common possession' of the Holy Spirit. Christmas speaks to us of the love of God in the gift of His Son, Good Friday and Easter of the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and Whitsuntide of the descent of the Spirit as the source of the life, power, and fellowship of the Christian community, the Church. Shelley's words :

> Life, like a dome of many-coloured glass,
> Stains the white radiance of Eternity,

are transformed in the Christian Year. 'The white radiance of Eternity' is refracted in many colours of objective history and subjective experience in time in the Christian revelation of God as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. It is the inestimable good of the Christian preacher to see for himself, and to show to others these many colours in time of the white radiance of Eternity—God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. To whom be adoration, devotion, and consecration for ever and ever.

Contributions and Comments.

'The Enigma of the Swords.'

'Let any one who has no sword sell his coat and buy one. For I tell you that these words of Scripture must find their fulfilment in me: And he was reckoned among the lawless; for indeed that saying about me now has its accomplishment.' 'Master, here are two swords,' they exclaimed. 'Enough,' he replied. (So Weymouth.)

In other words, the final crisis of His condemnation was on its way. They would have to face events cruel and sharp as swords.

'Here are two swords!' 'Well! well!' said Jesus gently. They would understand soon enough, experience would teach them all too soon, what He meant.

The crisis comes, and, as He is betrayed, the sword is drawn and used. 'Put back your sword again,' said Jesus, 'for all who draw the sword shall perish by the sword.' This is our Lord's terse, epigrammatic way of saying that force begets force, each combatant plunging farther and farther into the realm of force. The task delivered into their hands was quite otherwise. It was to declare and to keep alive, amid all the fearful clashes and cruelties of mankind, faith in the goodness of God as revealed in Jesus Christ and Him crucified—the Saviour of men, the very Word of God, God Incarnate.

'We do not yet see the universe subject to him' (to man, the spiritual, God-fearing man). 'But we do see Him who was made a little lower than the angels—even Jesus—because of His suffering of death crowned with glory and honour. . . .'

The centre of the world is not hollow, brainless, nor a grinding, unreasoning machine, but the Father of Jesus Christ our Lord.

To declare that was the disciples', the Church's specific mission. It was never more deeply charged upon the Church than it is to-day, for if that Lamp of lamps is extinguished, all the lights will go out.

Innes Logan.

Edinburgh.

'The Enigma of the Swords' (Luke xxii. 35–38).

Relative to my article in the July number of last year with the above title, a suggestion appears (May 1939), over the signature W. Western, that the term μάχαιρα might here mean, not a sword, but a fisherman's knife. With due deference to your correspondent I would point out that the word, apart from duplications, occurs over twenty times in the New Testament and never as a tool; always as a weapon. The fact is decisive against its bearing another meaning in Lk $22^{36.38}$. The term recurs in vv.$^{49.52}$ when it can only signify an offensive weapon.

The suggestion, were it regarded as feasible, would prompt questions: Is it likely that Jesus, in the over-shadowed hour before Gethsemane, would give the disciples so solemn a charge as to the advisability or necessity of their turning temporarily to their former vocation? For that employment what need had He to use such a figure as the fisherman's knife? Would Luke have thought it worth while to record a conversation whose significance turned upon so commonplace a figure? On such an interpretation what is the relevance of v.^{37}? Would Jesus have said that two knives of their craft would suffice a group of fishermen (if ἱκανόν ἐστιν can be strained to refer to the former)?

These are only some of the questions which your correspondent's interpretation suggests to my mind, but they may indicate my judgment, respectfully offered, against the tenability of his position.

T. M. Napier.[1]

Glasgow.

The Parable of the Two Sons (Matt. xxi. 28–31.)

In the usual text of Mt 21^{31}, the son who 'did the will of his father' is the son who said: 'I will not,' but 'afterwards repented and went.' But the text of D, most Old Latin manuscripts, and Sinaitic Syriac reverses this conclusion. In the parable the first son is the one who said he would not go but did, and the second is the one who said he would go but did not. The answer to Jesus' question is: 'The last' (ὁ ἔσχατος, *novissimus*). Wellhausen accepted this reading, and explained it as a defiant answer of the authorities, as they saw the point of Jesus' parable, as applying to themselves.

[1] This note was written only a few days before Mr. Napier's death in July.

A missionary, a lady doctor, who was for some years in India, tells me that a nurse in a mission hospital in Hyderabad told the parable to a group of patients, and asked them which son did the will of his father. They answered without hesitation: 'The one who *said* he would go, for he was polite to his father, while the other son answered him churlishly.'

May not this Eastern attitude of mind be the origin of the reading of D, etc.? It may be explained in one of two ways. Either the authorities adopted this attitude, and this reading gives their actual answer to Jesus' question (or perhaps the answer was originally given by the bystanders); or the usual text is original, and the D reading was made by a scribe who thought, like the Indian hospital patients, that the son who was polite to his father was the one to be commended.

HAROLD A. GUY.

Downham Market, Norfolk.

Adam and Enosh.

THE use of the name Adam for the first man in Genesis raises two difficulties: (1) Adam first occurs as a proper name in 4^{25}. Previously he is consistently referred to as 'the man,' although Eve is already named in 3^{20} 4^{1}, and the transition is made at 4^{25} without warning. (2) While Adam is the regular Hebrew word for 'man,' his grandson ($4^{25f.}$ J $5^{6ff.}$ P) is called Enosh, another word for 'man,' rare in Hebrew but common in Aramaic and other Semitic languages. It is generally assumed that Enosh originally figured in tradition as the first man.

There is considerable disagreement over the analysis of J in 1 and 2; but it is fairly certain that 4^{17-24} and $4^{25f.}$ 5^{29} (5 P) are duplicate versions of the same genealogy and therefore from different sources. 4^{1} goes with 4^{17-24}, since its use of Yahweh contradicts 4^{26} (cf. $3^{1ff.}$ 4^{25}), while it is probable that 4^{25} in its primitive form excluded Cain.

In 4^{25} the first man is Adam and his wife is unnamed; in the parallel source he is 'the man,' while Eve is named (4^{1}). The same applies to the only other reference to Eve (3^{20}). This raises the possibility that 'the man' in 3^{20} 4^{1} is not Adam and that we have here the tradition which called the first man Enosh.

In favour of this are (1) the parallel source, as reproduced in P (5^{9}); here the father of Cain (Kenan) is Enosh. (2) The puzzling use of 'the man' in 2–3 4^{1}. Since both Adam and Enosh mean 'man,' the redactor of the two sources might easily smooth over the inconsistency by reading 'the man' for both.

If this conjecture is accepted, it strengthens the case for a non-Israelite and probably Kenite origin of $4^{1.\ 17-24}$. It also makes it necessary to regard this as the earliest form of the genealogy; $4^{25f.}$ 5^{29} are the remains of an expanded version, which adds Adam and Seth unnaturally before Enosh. It is just possible that it is derived from the Sethites possibly referred to in Nu 24^{17}; if so the Sethite heroes Adam and Seth have been inserted deliberately before the Kenite heroes Enosh and Cain.

A. C. GRAHAM.

Penarth, Glamorgan.

Entre Nous.

Frustration.

'The noblest power that humanity possesses, and the most satisfying, is capacity to enrich the common welfare by the creative exercise of brain, hand, and strength in labour, so earning an honourable and independent status within the community. That is basic to the healthy growth and fulfilment of personality. Manhood is realized when a man earns by toil. If the right to gainful labour be denied, the wrong that is done is essentially a wrong to the soul; powers that God gave to be released in service are shut up in prison. . . .

'Across the divine affirmation of what his life was made to become society flings its denial; utters the command "Thou shalt not work," and that prohibition takes precedence of the will of God. The moral and spiritual effects of that upon personality are frightful. The energies that are prevented from their rightful exercise may easily seek expression in bitter and violent activity. Unemployment creates irresponsibility, degradation of character, madness and crime. . . .'

The Rev. G. Oswald Cornish has written a small book—*Crusade* (Independent Press; 1s. net)—

to give the answer of the Christ and Unemployment Crusade to the unemployment problem. It is his own personal contribution to the Crusade, and he hastens to say that the book must not be considered official. We may take it, however, that this does express the mind and purpose of the group, of which Mr. Cornish was one of the original members. It is their contention that unemployment is not a misery from which society is bound to suffer, but it is an evil for which we are responsible. To those who are afraid of imperilling the social structure by a radical policy against unemployment, Mr. Cornish pleads that prudential considerations urge us to action. 'If evil goes on to self-destruction because men refuse to abjure it, it perishes to the accompaniment of violence and catastrophe.'

The elements of a programme are laid down and no one would quarrel with them, except possibly with the fifth proposal, 'Legislative action to prohibit the exploitation of casual and under-paid labour and of women's work.' Reading the last four words in the light of the first paragraph which we quoted, this must surely bear a different meaning from that which appears on the surface. Speaking broadly, in industry women are usually found in the less responsible posts, where there is little opportunity for advancement. From much of the more skilled and consequently more highly paid work they are already barred by Trade Union restrictions, and perhaps one might say by prejudice. One would like to think that the members of this Crusade are planning rather to remove these disabilities than to intensify them.

A suggestive chapter is the one on Dedication. Not benevolence is wanted, but a costlier way. 'He did not scatter riches; He shared our poverty. A descent to our low estate there was, but we did not see it; though strange rumours of a God Who stooped to dust have blown about our ears since then. But we only saw Him where men are, in a need as great as theirs. "It's only the poor that *can* help the poor," cries Lizzie, in Maurice Hewlett's *Mainwaring*. With reverence, God found it so, and "laid His glory by".'

Modern Poetry.

We had pleasure some time ago in drawing attention to Miss Dallas Kenmare's 'Study of Browning.' Miss Kenmare has now published, through the Shakespeare Head Press, a collection of literary essays, which she had contributed to 'The Poetry Review,' 'The Modern Churchman,' and 'The Christian Pacifist.' The title is *The Face of Truth* (3s. 6d. net). Most of the essays deal with modern poetry. A paper on the Jesuit poet, Gerard Manley Hopkins, is noteworthy. 'Nevertheless, it seems to me a mistake to class Hopkins as a devotional poet in the ordinary sense of the word. His approach to God, and through God to poetry, in some indefinable way transcends the devotional. All the passion, the burning intensity that in other men would have found an outlet in human relationships, was in Hopkins transmuted into a passion for God and for nature: by no means a *substitute* for human emotion, nor even exactly a sublimation, to use the favourite word of psychotherapy, but the intensely real *transmutation* possible only to certain types.'

It is Miss Kenmare's contention that, as his inner experience deepened, Hopkins found it outgrowing the usual methods of expression. His use of language and rhythm sprang from the thought. She suggests a number of poems, which might be read to show his progress from the early traditional poetry to the later, full of awareness of mortal pain and its only solution. Readers might perhaps choose 'Heaven-Haven,' followed by 'The Leaden Echo and the Golden Echo,' 'Carrion Comfort,' one of the sonnets dealing with the reality of spiritual suffering, and end on a note of triumph with 'Hurrahing in Harvest.'

Another paper deals with T. S. Eliot. This shows his development from the early poems, with their sordid imagery, 'a poet sick of an overmastering spiritual and emotional nausea.' In 'The Waste Land,' there is the tension of extreme pain and the horror has worked itself to a climax. Five years later 'Ash Wednesday' appeared—a transition-poem 'admittedly religious, yet there are still traces of exhaustion, of doubt, though not a suspicion of the sordidness of the early work and of "The Waste Land" . . .'

'And this is the last conclusion of a man who has suffered too much: "consequently I rejoice, having to construct something upon which to rejoice." The only other solution would be death.

> And pray to God to have mercy upon us
> And I pray that I may forget
> These matters that with myself I too much discuss
> Too much explain.
> . . . . . .
> May the judgment not be too heavy upon us.'

Miss Kenmare then traces T. S. Eliot's develop-

ment in the later poem: 'The Rock' and the drama: 'Murder in the Cathedral.' 'The pilgrimage is ended, and there is peace; but a peace not even hinted at in the early poems and "The Waste Land," paradoxically stressful, "worried reposeful," the happiness of Christianity which inevitably includes the Cross.'

Knowledge of God.

'Unless my analysis of my memory is altogether at fault, the knowledge of God first came to me in the form of an awareness that I was "not on my own" but one under authority, one who "owed" something, one who "ought" to be something which he was not. But whence did this awareness come to me? Certainly it did not come "out of the blue."

'I heard no voice from the skies. No; it came, without a doubt, from what I may call the spiritual climate of the home into which I was born. . . . I cannot remember a time when I did not already dimly know that what opposed my own wilfulness was something much more than mere wilfulness on my mother's part. I knew she had a right to ask of me what she did; which is the same as to say that I knew that what she asked of me was right and that my contrary desire was wrong. I knew, therefore, that my mother's will was not the ultimate source of the authority which she exercised over me. For it was plain that she herself was under the same authority.

'Indeed, it was not only from my parents' specific demands on me that this sense of authority came to me but from the way they themselves lived.

'I cannot remember a time when I did not already know that what my parents demanded of me and what they knew to be demanded of themselves were in the last resort one and the same demand, however different might be its detailed application to our different situations. I cannot remember a time when I did not know that my parents and their household were part of a wider community which was under the same single authority.

'Nor, again, can I recall a time when I did not know that this authority was closely bound up with, and indeed seemed to emanate from, *a certain story*. . . .

'I could not hear a Bible story read without being aware that in it I was somehow being confronted with a solemn presence that had in it both sweetness and rebuke.

'It was, then, through the media of my boyhood's home, the Christian community of which it formed a part, and the "old, old story" from which that community drew its life, that God first revealed Himself to me. This is simple matter of fact.' [1]

Religion More Real.

'Duty, service, sacrifice—these are, as it were, streams of cleansing water amid a turbid flood, and they can make glad the city of the soul. . . .

'The present is a time when many people—not unbelievers, but people within our churches—are finding it increasingly difficult to make their religion what I may describe as adequately real. War is shatteringly real; and, in comparison, what is spoken about in sermons—while, no doubt beautiful and ideal, and, possibly, not untrue in some better world—seems, in this world, unreal or, at least, less real. Now, I believe—indeed, I shall presume to say that I know—that one way of making things of religious faith more real is to take hold of them not by intellectual reasoning, nor by devotional feeling, nor even by spiritual vision, but on their ethical side. Here is what is actual, graspable, doable; moreover, it is something surely of God—if God there be.' [2]

---

3 John 11.

Mr. H. Gordon Garbedian, whose biography of *Albert Einstein* has just appeared, says that the most extraordinary honour bestowed upon him was 'his adoption as a saint and a seer by one of the greatest and most beautiful Protestant Churches in America.'

When one New York outstanding Baptist Church, Riverside Church, was nearing completion, and the sculptors were ready to decorate the tympanum of the entrance with carved figures of the immortal leaders of the human race, the Trustees of the Church decided that they could not possibly omit Einstein.

'In the centre of the tympanum was the figure of Christ, surrounded by symbolical figures of the four Evangelists. Moses, Confucius, Buddha, and Muhammad appeared in rings of the doorway arch, and such scientists and philosophers as Hippocrates, Euclid, Newton, Darwin, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, and Spinoza surrounded the figure of the only living man on the tympanum.

'"How does it feel to find yourself among the saints?" asked a friend of Einstein. With a whimsical smile, the scientist replied with characteristic humility: "I must be very careful not to do any foolish thing or to write any foolish book, in order to live up to that distinction. I am proud

[1] J. Baillie, *Our Knowledge of God*.

[2] P. Carnegie Simpson, in *The British Weekly*, November 23, 1939.

of the honour, not on my account, but because I am a Jew. It certainly marks progress if a Christian Church honours a Jewish scientist."

'A furore was created by Einstein's presence among the immortals of history over the portal to Riverside Church,' says the author. 'Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, the pastor, explained in a sermon that the scientist belonged there because of his noble character and creative achievements, and because he was a supreme example of that New Testament description of the saintly: "He that doeth good is of God".'

Sin.

'We are being more and more forced to take a serious view of the evil in the world. All trite evolutionary theories of sin have been shattered by the grim reality of the present horror. We no longer sit in comfort spinning theories of the origin of evil, secure in the knowledge that we are on the crest of a great wave of human development. . . . Every now and then the curtain sways apart and we hear the snarl of the Beast from the wings. Often when we listen to the news we are driven to the uneasy conclusion that we are listening to the Devil's orchestra playing the overture of Hell. So there seems to be an evil which is behind and beyond the control of mankind.' [1]

Joy.

'The New Testament, with all its realistic background of stake and arena, is throbbing with the singing note of victorious love. And where do we turn to-day to hear the note of spontaneous joy? To the petulant ululation of the crooner, the sobbing swan-song of a decaying culture? To the contemporary novelist with his naked insistence on the pageant of human folly? To the marching armies of Fascist enthusiasm, with rubber truncheons and castor-oil? Or is it to the citadels of Christian faith where the Hallelujah chorus still finds an echo in the heart of man?' [2]

Indian Religious Poetry.

Mr. C. F. Andrews tells us in *The Inner Life* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net) that he has now reached the fiftieth year since he gave his heart to Christ. The purpose of this, his latest book, is the realizing of the abiding presence of Christ in daily life, and in it he describes the lessons of quietness and peace which have come to him from his Indian Christian friends. The last chapter deals with Indian religious poetry which has helped him and he chooses a number of Tilak's poems for quotation. We give the first of these, translated by Professor Nicol Macnicol.

A Cradle Song.

Hush thee, hush thee, baby Christ,
  Lord of all mankind;—
Thou the happy lullaby
  Of my mind.

Hush thee, hush thee, Jesus, Lord,
  Stay of all that art;—
Thou the happy lullaby
  Of my heart.

Hush thee, hush thee, Home of peace,—
  Lo! Love lying there!—
Thou the happy lullaby
  Of my care.

Hush thee, hush thee, Soul of mine,
  Setting all men free,—
Thou the happy lullaby
  Of the whole of me.

The Christian News-Letter.

The News-Letter is a modern development, but it is obviously meeting a need, and there are several varieties in circulation, each understood to have a considerable body of readers. The latest is *The Christian News-Letter*, issued under the auspices of the Council on the Christian Faith and the Common Life. We have pleasure in drawing attention to it. The subscription rate is 3s. for three months or 10s. for a year. Would-be subscribers should write to 20 Balcombe Street, Dorset Square, London, N.W.1. There should be no doubt about the value of the News-Letter when it is known that Dr. J. H. Oldham is the editor, and when the weighty list of collaborators is seen. The first six names may be taken as representative: The Archbishop of York, the Rev. M. E. Aubrey, Professor John Baillie, the Master of Balliol, Canon F. R. Barry, Dr. S. M. Berry.

---

[1] D. H. C. Read, *The Spirit of Life*, 57.
[2] *Ibid.*, 201.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.